LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of Labour Unity
Founded 1921
Editor: R. Palme Dutt

The H-Bomb

Nuclear Nihilists ★ R.P.D.

H-Bomb for Adenauer? ★ Gordon Schaffer

The Rats of Bikini ★ Ivor Montagu

The Mourning Vigil ★ 'A Woman in Black'

Special Number

June, 1957

One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAPER CIRCUSES

READERS of LABOUR MONTHLY cannot fairly complain that we do not keep them tipped off about the millionaire press monopoly. But now even the general public is sitting up and taking notice; for the press has itself been in the news recently. There was the rumoured merger of the *Daily Herald* and the *News Chronicle,* neither able to survive separately since 'popular journalism . . . has become geared to a two-million-plus circulation'. (*The Times*). More rumours, about the *Star* and *Daily Mirror.* Monopoly extended amongst provincial papers in South Coast counties. Finally *Picture Post* (funeral, June 1) passed out, which was no surprise to the trade. For the trained observer noted, during many months if not years, that *Picture Post* had abandoned brilliant illustrated journalism for half-concealed advertisements, puffing the latest American entertainer; whilst blatant song-hit plugging interrupted the more sinister drone of the weekly cold-war or class-war 'story'. All these were pointers. Then on May 15, after 19 years, its Chairman found that 'present conditions make its publication completely uneconomic'. A Parliamentary debate on May 17 cast further light on the state of things. A Labour Member, Mr. Frank Allaun, took powerful swings at the 'handful of men, extremely rich, extremely powerful' who find it easy to 'confuse the interests of their country with those of Big Business'. After pointing out that four combines with a trading profit last year of £27,000,000 dominated, and that seven groups controlled nearly all the national and Sunday papers, Mr. Allaun remarked: 'The dice is loaded against the common man and this form of ownership of the Press is vitiating our democracy. The freedom of the Press means the freedom of a few millionaires to print the news that suits them and to omit what does not.' Commenting that it would be surprising if such people did not 'bolster up a form of society under which they are doing very nicely indeed', he instanced the treatment of the Rent Bill, support for engineering employers and daily propaganda against the successes of the peoples in Socialist countries, as inevitable results of such vested interests. However, other speakers did not show his understanding; although they noted the effect of T.V. on advertising revenue, stressed the enormously increased (sixfold) cost of newsprint and pleaded that the Government should subsidise newsprint to offset vast 'North American' profiteering. Having had its experiences with that industry, *The Times* gave modified support to other M.P.s demanding investigation of newsprint by the Monopolies Commission. One claimed that the situation 'had not been publicised because the "big boys" of the Press owned or had interests in forests or paper mills.' As we explained in L.M. two years ago, apart from Lord Rothermere's family fortune in newsprint interests, the *Mirror* group's tie with the newsprint firm of Albert E. Reed was enormously profitable even then. The Bowater paper firm, which is of course immensely wealthy, announced recently through its chair-

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXIX, No. 6

CONTENTS

June, 1957

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: Nuclear Nihilists, by R.P.D.	241
NEW POEMS, by Mao Tse-tung	254
SOME THOUGHTS ON ENGINEERING, by J. R Scott	255
H-BOMB FOR ADENAUER? by Gordon Schaffer	259
THE RATS OF BIKINI, by Ivor Montagu	262
THE MOURNING VIGIL, by 'A Woman in Black'	268
THE INDIAN REVOLT OF 1857, by W. S. Adams	272
LABOUR DISCUSSION FORUM: V. Bannister, H. Clapson, R. Gore, M. Hicks, B. Selkirk, R. Short, D. Silk, B. F. Stern, E. H. Tudor	278
DRAWNGS OF AFRICA, by Paul Hogarth	264-265
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	288
Book Reviews:	
The Strange Case of Thomas Walker, by F. Knight: *G. Rudé*	284
Ivan P. Pavlov, by H. K. Wells: *S. Leff*	285
The Stalin Era, by A. L. Strong: *G. Hardy*	286
Tibet, by Alan Winnington: *D. N. Pritt, Q.C.*	287
American Radicals, Edited by H. Goldberg: *J.W.*	287

Notes of the Month

Nuclear Nihilists

'In the event of nuclear war there would be some areas where some people would survive.'

EARL OF HOME, Lord President of the Council, House of Lords, May 9, 1957.

WE are in danger of reaching the 'point of no return' on the formidable prospect of nuclear war. Britain's first hydrogen bomb has now been exploded in the Pacific. Japan's protests have been ignored. The Soviet proposals for an immediate all-round cessation of tests have been refused. Britain has made a counter-proposal for the 'registration', i.e., legalisation of all tests. A further series of countries is now pressing forward to enter into the nuclear arms race.

Towards Nuclear War?

The strategy of nuclear war is today being fed to public opinion as the 'normal' 'modern' strategy of any future major war, or even

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

('tactical atomic weapons') of a future limited war. General Norstad, Supreme Commander in the West, has reaffirmed in New York on May 12 that the Western Powers will 'use atomic weapons first', even if the other side does not. The Soviet Union has warned that the use of nuclear weapons by the West will be met with massive nuclear retaliation. Thus all the sights are set for a new nuclear world war, unless we stop the drift to catastrophe in time. What this would mean has been sufficiently explained. Such a prospect manifestly calls for the immediate response and action of every serious man and woman, irrespective of political outlook. Our contributor Ivor Montagu discusses this problem in the current issue. We make no apology for concentrating on this question first with damnable iteration also in these Notes, because it overshadows every other question—especially for us in Britain.

What Can We Do?

Public opinion has justly seized on the aim of stopping all tests as the indispensable *first step* in order to halt the race to ruin and advance to the further aim of banning and destroying all nuclear weapons and thus banish the menace of a nuclear war. The volume of support for this demand from all countries and all sections has been on a scale never before equalled on any issue. The Pope and Premier Bulganin, Dr. Schweitzer and the Emperor of Japan, Premier Nehru and even Premier Adenauer, Social Democrats and Communists, scientists and religious leaders and the widest range of political leaders, have been united in presenting this demand. The Labour Party, following the victorious initiative of the majority of Labour M.P's and the membership to compel a reversal of the initial disastrous Gaitskell line, calls for the suspension of tests in order to reach an international agreement for ending tests, and has shown in current elections that it represents the majority of the electorate. Religious organisations in Britain make the same demand. The innumerable petitions now circulating win support from the man and woman in the street everywhere. Yet this demand of the majority of mankind, including of the British people, is still resisted.

Our Responsibility in Britain

Three Powers are involved. If we delay, more states may be involved in the decision. Of the three Powers at present involved, two still so far oppose the proposal for an international agreement to end tests. We live in the country of one of the two Powers which block the way. Hence our special responsibility in Britain to force

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the battle forward to victory here. If we can make the British Government join with the Soviet Union in demanding an immediate international agreement to stop tests, then it will be difficult for the United States to hold out, especially in view of the volume of public and scientific opinion making the same demand there. The battle for the survival of Britain coincides with the battle for the future of humanity.

Why?

Why do the present rulers of Britain oppose the demand for an international agreement to end all nuclear tests and ban nuclear weapons? Why do they instead propose to reorganise the entire armed services for the aim of nuclear war? Everybody knows that Britain is more vulnerable than any other country in the world to utter destruction in a nuclear war. The Government have admitted in their White Paper that there is no possible defence for Britain in a nuclear war. They have admitted that six hydrogen bombs could exterminate Britain. Why, then, pursue a policy which, if carried out, would lead to the extermination of Britain? In these conditions of the vulnerability of Britain it might have been expected that any British Government would be the foremost and most insistent in the demand for the outlawing of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, it was a British Government that was the first, already nine years ago, to approve the stationing of atomic bomber bases in Britain and thus made Britain the main front line target in a nuclear war.

Death-Worshippers or Muddleheads?

Do they really want the destruction of Britain? Low as any sane man's opinion must be of this Tory Government and its intelligence (especially after the demonstration of their Suez adventure and its outcome), reason rebels against being forced to accept such a conclusion. It is true that some of them—like the British spokesman in the recent B.B.C. inter-country relay of spokesmen of six countries on the tests—openly declare that the destruction of Britain would not be such a fatal calamity, since 'Western civilisation' would continue to be represented by the Commonwealth and the United States. This view would hardly commend itself to the British population. A few top level executives or brasshats in their dugouts may calculate that in the day of reckoning they may still be protected in their exclusive deep shelters and able to migrate to Canada to continue the struggle for 'civilisation', and are already

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

encouraging the export of a sizable proportion of Britain's skilled workers and technicians to Canada in preparation. But even for the financial oligarchy whose interests are strategically spread over the world for tribute, and for whom Britain is only their base and theoretically expendable, Britain is still the base which locks up no small proportion of their capital and supply of skilled labour power, and therefore, not lightly to be abandoned.

Whom the Gods Wish to Destroy

Hence it is more reasonable to assume that their present strategy for nuclear war is not deliberately aimed to destroy Britain, but is rather the outcome of the same complex of obsessions, illusions, desperation, anti-Soviet phobia, deadly miscalculations and ignorance of the modern world, which already showed itself over Suez, and would now drive straight ahead, if unchecked, to a still more disastrous outcome. Anger and denunciation of a madman's policy is here no use. It is this vast structure of myths, illusions, fallacies, casuistry, and self-deception, built around the nuclear strategy, which it is necessary to clear away with patient explanation, in order to win whatever is sane in Britain for a sensible policy for Britain.

How It Began

It all began fifteen years ago. The Manhattan Project for the construction of the atom bomb started in earnest in September, 1942, when General Leslie Groves was put in charge. This was at the height of the battle for Stalingrad. General Groves has since related, in his answers recorded in the official report of the Oppenheimer hearings in 1954, the real purpose of the Manhattan Project:

> I think it important to state—I think it is well known—that there was never from about two weeks from the time I took charge of the project any illusion on my part but that Russia was the enemy and that the project was conducted on this basis. I didn't go along with the attitude of the country as a whole that Russia was a gallant ally. I always had suspicions and the project was conducted on that basis. Of course that was reported to the President.

All this is clear and familiar history. Stalingrad had demonstrated that the Soviet Union was not going to be wiped out by Hitler, as the British and American general staffs had confidently calculated. An alternative strategy had to be found. The Manhattan Project was then set going, according to the official testimony of the general in charge, for the construction of the atom bomb, not against Hitler, but as the weapon of Western supremacy against the Soviet Union

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after the defeat of Hitler. This coincides with the Churchill Memorandum of 1942 for the future battle against 'Russian barbarism'. The first atom bombs were dropped by the Western powers at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, not to hasten the defeat of Japan, which was already suing for peace, but to demonstrate Western invincible supremacy against the Soviet Union and popular revolution after the war. Hiroshima and Nagasaki were first shots in the cold war, which began in 1942 (not after 1945 through 'disappointment' with the Soviet Union, as the myth has it). All this is ancient history. The assumptions on which this strategy was based are long exploded. But their heritage still bedevils us, because the Western statesmen and strategists are still reluctant to face the facts of the modern world.

Lost Illusions

All history has shown (and Suez has illustrated it once anew) how reluctant are old once-mighty imperialist powers to reconcile themselves to the fact that they are no longer supreme in the world. The illusion of Western nuclear monopoly has long vanished. It is necessary to turn back to the entire Western press of the autumn of 1945 to recall how universal was the paean of glorification after the dropping of the atom bomb that Anglo-American power was now supreme in the world, that all other forms of armed forces were henceforth obsolete, and that all other powers and states would have to take a back seat and recognise Anglo-American world supremacy. This journal in its issue of September, 1945, was literally alone among journals and press organs at that time—as the record now demonstrates—in the Notes written within thirteen days of the dropping of the first atom bomb, in presenting four alternative propositions to the current trend: (1) that the dreams of nuclear monopoly would prove illusory; (2) that the atom bomb would not render obsolete the role of armed forces, of people; (3) that the atom bomb would not prove the weapon of Anglo-American world domination, but rather of American overlordship over Britain, reducing Britain to 'dependence' on the United States; and (4) that the long-term significance would prove, not in strategic, but in scientific and technological spheres which would 'revolutionise all social conditions'. Incidentally, readers of *Labour Monthly* may draw from this concrete example of these four propositions—now measurable in the record and outcome with the comment or prediction of every other journal at the time—the value of continuing to read *Labour Monthly*, if they wish to keep abreast of events, however outrageous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and infuriating its propositions have often seemed to readers at the time, until justified by the event (not always, but often enough to be some indication of the practical usefulness of Marxism as a guide) sometimes years later.

Where Do We Go From Here?

The end of the dream of Western nuclear monopoly (atomic by 1947, then the hydrogen bomb, then inter-continental jet planes, then guided missiles) should have meant a complete recasting of Western strategy. The only logical conclusion of the recognition of equality would be the recognition of the necessity to abandon the dream of dictating terms, of 'the showdown', and switching to a policy of genuinely negotiated settlements between equals on all issues, of peaceful co-existence. A first tentative step in this direction was taken at Geneva in 1955. But the outcome of even this first hint of a new era unloosed at once such a universal outburst of popular relief and joy at the prospect of an end of the cold war, and such a sweep forward of popular forces everywhere, of socialism and national liberation and fraternisation and co-operation of the newly independent states with the socialist world, that the imperialist leaders became aghast at the prospect of where a peaceful world was going, and reversed the engines. By the autumn of 1955, at the Foreign Ministers' Conference, Macmillan and Dulles repudiated the Geneva Directive. They returned to the path of aggression, of Suez and the Eisenhower Doctrine, of the bombardment of Port Said and the massacres in Algeria, of the attempted fomenting of counter-revolution in Eastern Europe, and gunboat diplomacy to crush democracy in Jordan. In every Nato declaration and official statement they stepped up the emphasis on nuclear strategy and nuclear war as the key guiding line of the Western powers. But this time without any longer the assumption of nuclear monopoly of superiority which had previously been the basis of the strategy. Hence they have now involved themselves in an inextricable mess of confusions and contradictions in explaining their strategy for nuclear war, in which every statement contradicts every other, and reason no longer operates. There remains only the desperadoes' aim of nuclear war.

Myth of the 'Great Deterrent'

Let us examine some of this mythology which seeks to justify the tenacious retention of nuclear weapons and continuance of tests. First and foremost comes the myth of the 'Great Deterrent.' Nuclear

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war, it is admitted, would mean general destruction. But for this very reason, it is argued, the knowledge of the possession of nuclear weapons by both sides deters both sides from war. Therefore the abolition of nuclear weapons would remove the deterrent to war. This is a very old fallacy. The fallacy lies in ignoring the realities of international politics, that is, the way in which modern wars develop. 'Brinkmanship' has been explained as the essence of modern Western policy. But the essence of 'brinkmanship' is that if attempted once too often the brink may be crossed.

How Wars Come

No major war of the twentieth century has come by deliberate calculation of either side at the moment of outbreak to enter on a war of the scale that subsequently developed. 1914 showed this. The explosion of the Sarajevo demonstration of Serbian national revolt against Austrian oppression; the determination of Austria to settle accounts with Serbia; the determination of Germany to back Austria; the determination of Russia to back Serbia; the French commitment to back Russia; the British commitment to back France: all followed in a chain until the powers had, in Lloyd George's subsequent phrase, 'stumbled' into world war. Even in 1939, while Hitler's general aims of world domination by war had been openly proclaimed for years, the moment and conditions of the outbreak of Anglo-German war in September, 1939, contradicted the previous calculations of both sides. Hitler had intended at this stage only to make war on Poland, and had counted on the same connivance of Britain and France as over Austria and Czechoslovakia. He had failed to realise that the German-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact meant an immediate switch of policy of Britain and France, who now regarded Hitler, no longer as the spearhead against communism to be assisted with secret collusion, but as the 'apostate' (in the phrase of the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax) to be chastised and corrected with at first merely 'phoney' war. Once again the chain unwound, link by link, to total world war beyond the initial calculation of any of the combatants at the moment of outbreak.

'Retaliation' Against 'Aggression'

So today the grave and real danger of a nuclear world war does not arise from a deliberate calculation of the Governments of either side to embark on a nuclear world war. If that were the danger, the argument of the alleged 'deterrent' effect of the knowledge of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possession on both sides of weapons of immeasurable mass destruction might have some validity. But that is not how major wars arise. The acute danger of a new world war arises from *local explosive situations*. The Nato powers have proclaimed that they have no intention of launching an offensive war against the Soviet Union, and that they do not believe that the Soviet Union has any such intention either (Lord Ismay's statement on May 14). Does that mean that all is well and we can rest in peace? Far from it. For the Nato powers have also proclaimed that they will launch instant 'retaliation', including with atomic weapons or 'with all the weapons we have got' against 'aggression' anywhere in the world.

From Local War to World War

What is 'aggression'? The definition remains secret. But we may note that, when the United States Navy moved into the Eastern Mediterranean at the end of April and landed marines in Lebanon, with openly proclaimed readiness for instant action, if judged necessary, over Jordan, the definition of 'aggression' to justify the action proved sufficiently elastic to describe the elected left wing parliamentary majority in Jordan as an 'aggression' of 'international communism'; and the military coup to overthrow parliamentary democracy as a justifiable action against 'aggression' and worthy of support. The danger of a major war arises in consequence, not from the intention of any leading power to launch it, but from the diplomacy of 'peace through strength', the decision to respond to an explosive local situation by a 'strong stand', a 'display of military force', a 'limited military action' or an intended 'local war'. Such a 'local war', the Nato powers have now explained, will be waged by them with 'tactical atomic weapons'. It is easy to see how such an atomic 'local war', launched by the Western powers in accordance with their present programme, could rapidly extend to regional war, and so in a twinkling of an eye to nuclear world war without any explicit original intention of any government to have launched such world war. That is why the theory of nuclear weapons as a 'deterrent' to war is such a catastrophic suicidal theory. The only effective deterrent against a nuclear war is the banning and destruction of nuclear weapons.

The Bee and the Sting

The fallacy of the 'deterrent' myth applies with especial force to Britain. Britain armed with the hydrogen bomb, Mr. Strachey has poetically explained, is like the bee with its sting. The use of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sting will kill the bee. But the possession of the sting saves the bee. Britain is thus the harmless defensive hard-working bee, only seeking to protect itself against the aggressive Soviet marauder (Mr. Strachey has had practical experience of Britain's 'defensive' wars when he dispatched his bombers and troops thousands of miles across the sea to invade Malaya and personally supervised the operations against the Malayan Liberation Army). The assumption is that a powerful Soviet Union is preparing to overwhelm a defenceless Britain. 'The Communist threat remains', declares the Defence White Paper. 'The only existing safeguard' is 'retaliation with nuclear weapons'. Britain possesses atom bombs and will soon be manufacturing a 'stock' of hydrogen bombs. The 'means of delivering these weapons', will require 'ballistic rockets' or 'medium range missiles' from the United States. When these are supplied, Britain will be safe. And until then? We had the same argument with the Nato rearmament programme. A powerful and malevolent Soviet Union, it was explained, was bent on overrunning a defenceless Western Europe; but when the rearmament programme had been fulfilled in three years', five years' or seven years' time, then Western Europe would be strong enough to repel the attack. And meanwhile? Why the wicked men of the Kremlin, supposed to be powerful enough and eager to overrun Western Europe, should be simultaneously gentlemanly enough to refrain from doing so until certain their attack could be repelled, was never explained. The unspoken assumption exposed the dishonesty of the argument. This applies still more to the Defence White Paper.

The Years Between

James Reston, Washington correspondent of the *New York Times*, unkindly described the plan of the Defence White Paper in the following terms:

> They are reducing their conventional armed forces, which they can't afford, and relying on atomic weapons and ballistic rockets, which they haven't got.

When will the American guided missiles, which are the lynch-pin of the whole programme, be delivered? In 1960? In 1962? There is no answer. Mr. Dulles explained to his press conference on March 26:

> The whole project is still in an experimental stage. These missiles are not actually flying yet, and we can't predict with absolute certainty as to when they can be made available for the United Kingdom.

Press reports have stated that it may be five years before American intermediate-range ballistic missiles are ready for delivery. And

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until then? If these weapons are really indispensable, as the White Paper claims, for Britain's defence, it might be thought that Ministers must be in a panic of anxiety for these five years. Instead, they appear to be sleeping peacefully in their beds. Not by their words, but by their practice they show that they know that the menace they seek to conjure up is imaginary. As even Lord Montgomery stated in New York on May 7:

> It is unlikely that a nuclear war will be launched by Russia in the foreseeable future.

The real aim of the insistence on the development of nuclear strategy and nuclear weapons has very little to do with the supposed aim of Britain's 'defence'.

Myth of 'Modern Weapons'

Another myth currently spread to reconcile public opinion to the horror of nuclear warfare is to describe nuclear weapons as 'modern weapons' which only a hopelessly unpractical reactionary can oppose. Thus M. Spaak, preparing to take over the post of Secretary of Nato from Lord Ismay, declared that to oppose nuclear weapons was equivalent to opposing 'modern weapons', and that the logic of such a policy would be to propose we should go back to bows and arrows. The fallacy here is obvious. By this argument poison gas, chemical warfare, the spreading of plague or poisoning of water supplies should all be regarded as legitimate forms of warfare. For nuclear war in fact combines all these and more. A certain school of strategists, like Ludendorff with his conception of total war, or the United States Chemical Warfare Department has advocated such methods. But the plain reason of human self-preservation opposes them. When the issue of poison gas arose, the powers united to outlaw it, without waiting for a general disarmament agreement. How much more is this necessary in relation to nuclear warfare?

'Tactical Atomic Weapons' and Nuclear War

A similar myth spread to reconcile public opinion to nuclear warfare is to attempt to draw a distinction between 'tactical atomic weapons' and the hydrogen bomb or 'strategic' nuclear warfare. President Eisenhower, Mr. Sandys, and the American and British general staffs all now describe 'tactical atomic weapons' as equivalent to 'conventional weapons'. On February 13 Mr. Sandys declared that atomic weapons of the power of the Hiroshima bomb were now regarded as suitable for tactical use by troops in the field.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The casualties caused by the Hiroshima bomb were 100,000 dead, 100,000 wounded and sick; 98,000 still requiring clinical examination in 1956 as a result of wounds and 21 deaths from radiation sickness still continuing in 1956. To regard this as equivalent to an artillery weapon for use 'in the field'; to imagine that the destruction caused by its use would not extend far beyond any limited 'tactical' operation; to assume that the consequent atomic warfare thus opened would not rapidly expand into general nuclear warfare: all this is to attempt to deceive the public. The invalidity of this supposed distinction, which attempts to smuggle through atomic weapons as 'conventional weapons', has now become generally recognised. As Air Marshal Lord Tedder stated in the House of Lords debate on May 9:

> He hoped they would not allow the issue to be clouded by suggestions that tactical atomic weapons could be used without leading to the use of the ultimate strategic weapon. To believe that would be to live in a fool's paradise. A hard and fast line between strategic and tactical atomic weapons could not be drawn.

To accept 'tactical atomic weapons' is to ask for the hydrogen bomb.

Myth of 'Disarming the West'

A further myth still continuing to be put in circulation in order to defend nuclear warfare is to argue that any proposal to ban nuclear weapons is equivalent to a proposal to 'disarm the West' by depriving it of its favourite and most advantageous weapons. It is a revealing commentary on this argument that the same Western spokesmen who use it proclaim in their next breath that their ardent desire to ban nuclear weapons is only impeded by failure to secure agreement as yet on the details of control and inspection. The crudest form of this myth was that employed by the latest Nato Council communiqué on May 3 which declared the aim of the Soviet campaign against nuclear weapons was 'to ensure for Russia a monopoly of nuclear weapons'. This is really to underestimate Western popular intelligence by assuming complete ignorance of the fact that the Soviet demand is for the banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons of all powers.

Nuclear Weapons and General Disarmament

A more frequent form of this argument for nuclear warfare is to declare that the banning of nuclear weapons would leave the Soviet Union in a position of superiority on the basis of its larger conventional forces. The assumption underlying this argument is in fact

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without foundation, as an examination of the available evidence of the strength of the total armed forces of the Nato powers on the one side, and of the Soviet Union and People's Democracies on the other, would show. But the practical answer is straightforward. The figures for an agreed limitation of armed forces on both sides, so as to exclude superiority on either side, have already been long before the Disarmament Sub-Committee, and have not been seriously contested by either side, since in fact the Soviet Union took over the figures of the Anglo-French proposals, leaving the Western powers in a considerable quandary to find any reason for opposing them. Thus an agreement on the limitation of conventional armed forces could be reached tomorrow if the desire were there. The banning of nuclear weapons should lead the way to wider general disarmament. But the urgent immediate necessity of banning nuclear weapons must not be made to wait for the longer term agreement on general disarmament.

Myth of 'Equal Blame'

A special gambit sometimes employed to confuse or divide the labour and peace movement in the demand for the ending of tests is to declare that all three powers are equally to blame, since all continue tests. This argument will not hold water. Anyone can see the difference between a power which calls for agreement to end tests, and is only compelled to continue them because the others refuse such an agreement, and the two powers which oppose an agreement to end tests and therefore hold responsibility for their continuance. The Soviet Union calls for an agreement of the three powers to end all tests. Britain and the United States still oppose this. If they were to agree, all tests would end tomorrow. Until then, the Soviet Union is compelled to keep abreast strategically of imperialism; to fail to do so would be to fail in its duty to the whole future of the world. We can recognise the sincerity of the view of the tiny section of absolute pacifists who believe that if the Soviet Union had disarmed and opened its frontier to Hitler in the thirties, Hitler would never have attacked. The majority of mankind is thankful that the Soviet Union was strong and prepared to be able to tear the guts out of the Nazi armies. When we oppose the Christmas Island tests we are not calling for the unilateral disarmament of Britain; we are demanding that the Government, instead of wasting Britain's resources on a hydrogen bomb, should unite with the Soviet Union demand for the ending of tests and banning of nuclear weapons, as corresponding to the vital interests of Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our plain job is to force our Government to advance to the level of the stand already taken by the Soviet Union, that is, to call for an international agreement to end tests and ban nuclear weapons. Any attempt to divert this plain task into an anti-Soviet channel is to play the game of the nuclear war strategists.

The Real Menace

It is evident that in all this fog of contradictory arguments presented to defeat the campaign for ending the menace of nuclear war, we are faced, not with a rational case, but either with casuistry or with simple confusion. The grave reality remains the determination of ruling circles in Britain and the United States and the other Nato powers to cling to the strategy of nuclear war. We would be reluctant to accuse these rulers of consciously desiring to destroy the world in a nuclear war, although some aggressive spokesmen, often influentially placed, have used language very close to this. The real menace is that these imperialist rulers, conscious of their weakening in the world balance, regard this nuclear strategy as essential to maintain their policy of strength, to redress the balance, to force their solutions in given local situations, and are thereby creating the situation when their weapons would finally be used and nuclear world war would result. To prevent this it is essential to ban nuclear weapons in time. But such a ban can only be part of a policy for peace, to turn away from the policies of strength which find their expression in the nuclear strategy, and to return to the alternative path of negotiated settlements, of renewed top-level meetings of the leading powers, of peaceful co-existence. The world-wide campaign for the agreed ending of all nuclear tests now represents the essential step forward which unites the support of the overwhelming majority of people in Britain and the world, and thus opens the way to the further steps for banning all nuclear weapons, for general disarmament and for a peaceful world.

May 16, 1957. R.P.D.

In the new poems over-leaf Mao Tse-tung recalls first the battles of thirty years ago, when the Red Army base was set up on Ching Kan mountain in the south of Kiangsi province. In the second poem, Peitaiho is a seaside resort and Chingwantao a nearby seaport not far from Peking in the province of Hopei, which is here given its ancient name of Yu-yen. The Lord of Wei was a famous emperor, who also wrote some very fine poems.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW POEMS *by Mao Tse-tung*

Translated by Rewi Alley

AT CHING KAN SHAN

Looking from the mountain side
we saw the flags of an army,
while right up the slope, came
the sound of their bugles and drums;
enemy troops encircled us in
all their thousands, yet here
we stayed at ease, without anxiety;
for all our defences
were in order, spirits high;
at Huang Yang Chieh guns boomed
then came a messenger reporting
'In the night the enemy
has gone into full retreat'.

PEITAIHO

Over this ancient frontier
of Yu-yen, rain falls
and on the shore, great white breakers
throw high their spray;
outside Chingwantao lie many fishing boats
but now nought of them can be seen;
a thousand years before, the Lord of Wei
rode his horse clear over here
pointing the way with his whip; and the words
he wrote, cut on stone, have come
down to us; now the same autumn wind blows
but with the affairs of men,
all has changed.

(*World Copyright Reserved*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME THOUGHTS ON ENGINEERING

J. R. SCOTT

EVERYTHING that happens in the engineering industry is important. It is Britain's greatest exporting industry. Engineering goods and products find their way to the four corners of the earth. It is from these exports that our imports of food and raw materials are obtained. This industry is one of the foundation stones of British economy.

The wages and working conditions of the workers in the shipbuilding and engineering industries are important too: they also are foundation stones of British economy, particularly so for the organised workers in every phase of employment throughout the British Isles. In these industries we have on the one hand the powerful well organised and disciplined Employers Federations and on the other hand the forty unions held together by the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions. The Confederation is today the largest organised body of workers dealing collectively with wages and general working conditions. This brief picture shows quite clearly that the relationship between these two opposing forces has great consequences for the rest of the working class. The events of the past months therefore are worthy of examination and a few thoughts can be of value to all.

There should be no real surprise to us that the engineering and shipbuilding employers took the lead in publicly declaring before any wages claim was made to them that their answer would be a definite refusal. They have class interests. They have their Tory Government in power. Their main political line was to depress the standard of living of the workers by rising prices without the parallel rise in wages, to increase productivity and output without any further costs to themselves and at the same time increase their profit margin to enable shareholders to collect more and to extend and reorganise sections of industry where necessary without raising further capital. In other words private property was to be strengthened and put more firmly in the saddle at the expense of the workers.

So a whole sequence of events took place. Negotiations, meetings with the Ministry of Labour and eventually a Court of Inquiry whose report brings forward a number of recommendations and suggestions of a far-reaching character not only as far as the workers in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that industry are concerned but directly and indirectly affecting workers by and large. Paragraphs 53, 54 and 55 of this Report surely have more than a casual interest to organised workers. For that purpose the paragraphs are quoted:

53. We think that there is a case for a re-examination of the procedures for dealing with differences which arise between the two sides of the industry. As we have seen, some alteration at workshop level has already taken place but we think that a more comprehensive scrutiny of existing procedures would be beneficial. And we think the parties should give careful consideration to the desirability of including in their agreed procedure a provision whereby unresolved disputes at district and national level should be referred to arbitration.

After this unabashed proposal for arbitration, which is always put forward for privately-owned industry at a time when the workers are on the move and seldom when employers are operating an offensive, the Report raises the question of inflation.

54. We come now to a problem which has given us much concern. The wages problem in recent years has become an integral part of an inflationary situation which confronts the whole economy. Employers see in the recurring annual demands for wage increases a form of pressure which raises their production costs and which is so general that it cannot be associated with the economic condition of a particular industry. Unions, on the other hand, feel impelled to press for higher wages to compensate for the upward movement in retail prices and to provide in advance some protection against the further rise in retail prices which is anticipated. Both sides of industry are anxious that the inflationary process should be terminated but are unable to agree upon the appropriate measures to attain that end. In each industry it is perhaps inevitable that each party should take a sectional view of its own interest though on both sides of industry as a whole there are to be found spokesmen who have a consciousness of the larger issues which are involved and who have a genuine desire to meet them.

Though the usual propaganda about wages claims causing inflation is here put forward very cleverly (cleverly in that it avoids any mention of the main cause of inflation in the thousands of millions sterling flung in the huge arms programme) the Report comes back to it on another tack in the next paragraph. But here their cleverness over-reaches itself: for the paragraph actually shows that swollen prices, caused by swollen re-armament, affects all workers and all industries.

55. We have noticed that though in the claim with which we are concerned much emphasis was placed on the profitability of the industry and on its productivity, the wage claims which have been submitted over the whole field of industry have conformed to a certain pattern irrespective of the profitability of individual industries or of their productivity. We think that this goes some way to support our view that the wages problem as it now presents itself is in the main an element in a larger

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

problem of inflation and that it fails to be dealt with in that setting.

Here, then, is a definite suggestion to re-examine the procedure agreements with arbitration as the end of district and national negotiations. Here again is raised this point relative to the causes of inflation. True that there is nothing new as such in these suggestions. What is important is that they should be raised at the time in which the largest offensive struggle had been entered into by the unions. A large battle-front on an extended basis had been in operation to force the Employers to retreat from their negative position into a situation of making some concessions to the workers.

On the other hand the Employers had seemed to take on the role of a super-government. One of its leading spokesmen had made it quite clear that they wanted to fight it out with the unions, and other leading people in the Employers Federation had also made statements like 'only over my dead body will we concede an increase in wages'.

All these events should raise in our minds wider and even more important questions for discussion and action. This country cannot afford the luxury of such an arrogant body of employers. Their conduct over recent months constitutes a danger and a menace to Britain's economy. Their declared policy is dangerous to the working class—in fact to the whole labour movement. There seems to be little doubt where they would stand when we get a Labour Government. To raise the question of curbing their power seems to have importance to all.

Ever since the end of the war the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions has been concerned with a 'Plan for the Engineering Industry'. Documents and pamphlets on this have been presented to succeeding Governments since 1945. Talks and interchange of documents have taken place with the Trades Union Congress Economic Committee. Those talks are in progress now. The original Plan for Engineering (and the subsequent documents) has continually raised the necessity of this industry being brought under public control. It has advanced the view that this industry is vital to this nation's economy: and has put forward concrete suggestions how to handle its ever changing character so that it could play an even more important role. The Plan may not have the complete answer to all detailed points but it does raise fundamental matters and is a challenge to the industry. Given friendly approaches and suggestions it has the groundwork of advance and if fought for and brought into effect would revolutionise this powerful basic industry. This Plan needs to be publicised just now on a very wide scale and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discussion promoted over a very wide field.

Nationalising either part or all of the engineering and shipbuilding trades would be a contributory factor towards resolving some of the problems. To take this industry out of private hands would enable the industry to become more integrated. It could be reorganised from the bottom to the top. It would enable new developments to take place and for the varying sections to interlock each with the other into the whole. For the workers it could be made an industry to be proud of. It would remove fears of unemployment. Negotiations could be conducted and concluded on an entirely new basis with a recognition of the crafts, skill and ability of its workers.

This Court of Inquiry would have rendered a greater service to Britain's economy if it had made these suggestions and most workers would have felt that the Court was really grappling with the essentials. Compulsory arbitration and a super body of economic experts make no contribution to resolving or partially resolving the fundamental differences between the Employers and the Unions. Those suggestions seek to have the appearance of 'fair play'—a false sort of 'fair play'. The Employers have made it quite clear what is in their minds. They want unrestricted increased productivity and profits. In that *gear* they brook no interference. They now seek managerial rights 'plussed up'.

From the angle of the Unions the events of the past few months must give impetus to the question of amalgamation. The Confederation does a good job in bringing under one umbrella all the engineering unions and in many respects resolves some of the individual unions' trials and tribulations. But each have their sovereign rights and by the very nature of this it gives rise in times of crisis to delays, variation of instructions to its respective members and at times, things much worse. A solution could be found in amalgamation, and without losing identity of craft or trade. A willingness to give as well as take, a recognition of certain vested interests, personal pride of place and many such similar things could be resolved as the living body of amalgamation begins to take shape. This is the way forward in building up the unions. The strength of the unions must grow not only numerically but in organisation as well.

This battle with the employers cannot be looked upon as the last one. More may have to take place. So it is imperative that loose ends need to be gathered in, structures examined with a view to improvement and (both generally and specifically) organisation improved and strengthened.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

H-BOMB FOR ADENAUER?

GORDON SCHAFFER

FROM the first moment the leaders of the Western powers set out on the mad project of recreating the West German army, this day has been approaching—the day when the decisions of peace or war will be in the hands of the men who backed Hitler and who dream of the day of revenge. In the years when the battle was being fought against German rearmament, spokesmen far away from the Left, like Walter Lippman, warned that the result would be to drag the Western allies into a war to restore the territories Hitler lost. Even then, before a single soldier was in uniform, the revisionists made no secret of their aims.

Today, the demand for 'free elections' and the right of a united Germany to remain in Nato, which is voiced in Bonn and echoed in Westminster, can mean only one thing—an attempt to bring an atomic armed German army to the Oder-Neisse line. Do even the most confirmed opponents of the Soviet Union believe that Europe would be safer if that were to be permitted? And do they imagine a revisionist Germany will confine its demands to the East? What right have they to refuse a share in Western colonial exploitation to their new ally? How can West Germany test her H-bombs if she is not allowed territories where she can spread atomic radiation far away from her home territories? These are not fantasies. These are the logical results of accepting the West German militarists as allies in the cold war against the Soviet Union. West Germany today is moving into position as the second strongest industrial power in the West. She will soon occupy the same position militarily. When that happens she will dictate policy.

These were the dangers the Potsdam agreement was designed to prevent. The allies recognised that defeated Germany must be restored to her position as a great nation, but only after the elimination of Nazism and the causes of Nazism. The processes laid down at Potsdam—the removal of all who were active supporters of Hitler from positions of authority, the break-up of the great trusts on which Germany relied in two wars, land reform and so on—were designed to achieve this policy. In the West they were betrayed. S.S. troops up to the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel are accepted in their former rank in the West German army. Speidel commands Nato's land forces. The trusts are back.

Those are the hard facts about the German situation which cannot be evaded. That is the background to the Soviet Note to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

West German Government declaring: 'Western Germany is becoming Nato's main shock force for waging atomic war in Europe' and warning that to equip Western Germany, 'the only European state whose government is demanding revision of the existing frontiers of Europe with atomic weapons will aggravate the danger of war and compel neighbouring countries to take appropriate measures to strengthen their defence'.

Adenauer's reply to this warning and to the Soviet reminder that in a nuclear war Western Germany could not escape disaster appears to be on the same line as Macmillan's answer to the appeal to stop the H-bomb tests. Britain to prove she is a great power must test hydrogen bombs. West Germany to prove she is a great power must have atomic arms, even though both know the policy can lead only to disaster. Again the British Government bears a heavy responsibility. The White Paper committing Britain to complete nuclear rearmament is a standing invitation to every other power claiming military greatness to enter the dance of death.

The dangers are clear enough, but there are hopeful features as well. The Nazi generals are back in Western Germany but they have not yet achieved the position of a Hitler. They have secured a legal prohibition of the Communist Party but they have not succeeded in weakening the resistance of the Communists to their policies. The Social Democratic Party and the West German T.U.C. are still opposing the re militarisation of their country and the placing of atomic weapons on German soil. The Socialist parties in the West, including the British Labour Party, bear a heavy responsibility for having allowed their leaders to oppose the West German socialists when they opposed the rearmament treaties. Surely, they will not be allowed to desert the West German socialists when on the eve of the elections they resist the plan to turn their country into an atomic base.

The West German scientists have won nation wide support for their declaration refusing to take any part in nuclear armaments and incidentally have given the lie to the German counterparts of Selwyn Lloyd who try to suggest that opposition to H-bombs is a communist plot. If the pressure on the governments is maintained so that they sincerely seek agreement at the London talks on the first stages of disarmament, the way will be open for a new effort to solve the German problem. No one now denies that the latest Soviet Note goes a long way to overcome the technical problems of inspection, control and the other measures necessary to make a disarmament agreement effective. It is inconceivable that the powers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would allow the danger of the German situation to grow, once they had taken the first steps for disarmament.

What then are the conditions for a solution of the German problem? First, the existence of two German states with different economic and social systems must be recognised. That means the Federal Republic and the Democratic Republic must discuss the methods of achieving immediate forms of co-operation and a basis for eventual reunification. Second, the arms race must stop now. Two states arming against each other cannot discuss unity. The offer of the government of the German Democratic Republic to limit forces to a small voluntary army on both sides of the zonal frontier and to ban atomic arms in both republics, is the sort of step that will have to be accepted if serious discussions are to begin.

Third, there must be freedom for all parties including the West German Communist party. In the German Democratic Republic, the Christian Democrats, the Liberal Democrats and the Socialist Unity Party operate. The Socialist Unity Party is an amalgamation of Socialists and Communists but much has happened since then and in the event of genuine negotiations on all-German elections, there would certainly be a case for an all-German Social Democratic Party. Equally, German democrats would have the right to demand the removal from key positions in the West —political, military and industrial—of the former Nazis who have openly proclaimed a policy of revenge.

If the German people reached this stage, the next step, the replacement of Nato and the Warsaw alliances by an all-European security treaty, would not be beyond the realm of practical politics. In any case a lightly armed neutral Germany and the extension of the neutral area on the lines hinted at by Mr. Bevan and Mr. Gaitskell would be the obvious next steps.

In the light of the terrifying developments of the last few months, this picture may seem Utopian, but the simple inescapable fact is that there is no other way. Unless a halt is called to the policy of the Western powers of scattering 'tactical' atomic weapons (about the size of the bombs used at Hiroshima) to trigger-happy generals from Bonn to Formosa, the human race faces annihilation. But even the most hesitating step towards agreement will set the engines in reverse, because the human race today is aware of the danger. The pressure of the peoples for an end to the nuclear arms race and for a new initiative by the great powers to break down the barriers dividing the world, is stronger than ever before. It can be made irresistible. Germany is at the heart of all the problems dividing the world and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threatening atomic war. Inevitably therefore a solution of the German problem presents the greatest difficulties but if the people are alerted to the dangers, if the forces seeking agreement and peace in both German republics are given the support they deserve, a solution can be found. But action must be swift before the atomic madmen are able to take their own decisions.

THE RATS OF BIKINI

IVOR MONTAGU

THE rats of Bikini, it appears, have made something of a scientific sensation. After the test explosions it was confidently supposed not only that all life had been destroyed but that the island had been made uninhabitable to living things. Now, it is rumoured, rats are re-establishing themselves on the island. Like bacteria pursued by penicillin, flies by D.D.T., rabbits by myxomatosis, the rats are re-multiplying through immune strains. Is this humanity's hope of survival? Or are we cleverer than the bacteria, flies, rats and rabbits—are we to stop the bombs from going off?

This question is forced upon us now, because, after a long period of prevarication in various forms, it is at last apparent and being admitted that the whole military organisation of the most powerful states is being oriented to preparing nuclear war and nothing but nuclear war. The whole process has been so gradual that it is hard even to recollect the stages in the progression. After the first massacres ordered by President Truman at Hiroshima and Nagasaki—a slaughter which history and Professor Blackett have shown quite conclusively had not even remote connection with any military project or the Japanese war, but had its fount even then in anti-Soviet rivalry—it was the fashion to pretend that the U.S. and British Governments desired nothing more earnestly than the elimination of such a weapon, provided only it could be controlled.

Since then has followed a propaganda interregnum, a softening-up, or rather hardening-up, process directed against the human conscience. Generals and political spokesmen were encouraged, and never disciplined, for licking their lips gloatingly over 'killing parties'. A farcical pretence was for a time maintained that civil protection was conceivable—remember the tin shelters and brown paper? Successive schemes, each known to be more unrealisable than the last, were put forward to mark time—first, the Baruch Plan,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which would effectively have placed the economic development and prospects of the entire world under American control; then, the Open Skies Plan, which, when uncoupled with any renunciation of the bomb, simply meant providing a blue-print of all vital Soviet installations to the American bomber-fleet in its encircling bases; last, the linking of any progress whatsoever in nuclear disarmament to a general disarmament plan and the linking of the latter to a general settlement of all political problems at issue between the powers. Successive restraints have been mulled over and rejected; that nuclear weapons should be used only with U.N. consent, or only if the enemy used the bomb first, or only 'tactically'—it is now acknowledged that the nuclear weapons to be made the 'conventional' basis of the Nato armies' 'tactics' are 'only' the same strength as those used in Japan in 1945.

The official position of the U.S. and British Governments now is: that any new war will be a nuclear war, that admittedly no distinction can be expected to be made between nuclear weapons 'tactical' and 'strategic', that admittedly there is and can be no effective protection for civilians in such a war, that the consequences to humanity of such a war may be, and to Britain must inevitably be, disastrous. It is on these assumptions that the Ministry of 'Defence' —save the mark—is conducting all its training, preparations and propaganda. The only restraint these Governments will admit upon their launching of such a war is that they will do so only to repel 'aggression', of which they themselves must rest sole judge—cold comfort to a world which has seen so recently what this term can be dislocated to mean in justification of the bombing of Port Said or the dispatch of the U.S. 6th Fleet to the Levant.

Add to all this the insistence that there shall be nuclear weapons in West Germany, under a Government that refuses to recognise its Eastern frontiers and generals who served Hitler, and the picture is complete.

'Are you a man or a mouse?', was the inspiriting question constantly put to himself by Eddie Cantor in a famous film of olden time. 'Are we men or rats?' is the question now confronting us. That is, shall we rely passively for survival on gene-mutation to repopulate the earth, after a myriad casualties, with beings of reduced sensitivity to radiation, or shall we stop this insanity now? World public opinion is beginning to see in the halting of nuclear test explosions a crucial first step. It is quite correct in doing so, despite the pseudo-scientific derision of Lord Cherwell (*né* Lindemann).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drawings of Africa

Southern Rhodesia : Forestry worker

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Paul Hogarth

South Africa : Sugar Cane worker and family, Natal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The refusal to suspend tests is a 64,000 dollar matter. It makes no sense at all except as part of a determination to continue preparation for nuclear war. Test explosions *are* self-policing, the contrary statements first of Eden, then of MacMillan and Eisenhower notwithstanding: these are a delusive reference to explosions so high above the atmosphere or so deep underground that, though they may be theoretically possible, they are impractical and likely indefinitely to remain so, besides being almost as certainly non-harmful and non-informative as they are currently impossible. The only conceivable sense in refusing to agree to suspension pending wider agreement is the fear that, once agreement, even on this narrow field, was shown to be possible, public opinion might insist on extending it, and neither tests nor preparations might ever be resumed.

At the time of the Stockholm Appeal, when 650 millions signed a demand for resumption of nuclear disarmament negotiations, then currently interrupted, to be against the bomb was said to be being a Communist or a fellow-traveller, a traitor, stooge or dupe. The Lloyd revival of this charge now, in connection with the manifold demands to end the tests, carries less weight. (What a blessing is T.V., that it enables the people to see their politicians, the ignorant, complacent, parrot faces, the frightened, shifty little eyes.) We Communists are proud to be in the forefront of activity against the H-bomb. We are glad that it is a Communist Government, that of the U.S.S.R., which, alone among the three so far possessing the capacity for bomb-making, has incessantly proposed to the others renunciation of nuclear warfare, destruction of nuclear weapons and instant, immediate, unconditional, stopping of all tests. We do not object to fellow-travelling with the Pope and Albert Schweitzer and Adlai Stevenson and the Japanese Parliament and the Swedish Government and the German Social Democrats and Russell and the Bundestag and the Baptists and the Council of Churches and the German atomic scientists and the British atomic scientists and the American atomic scientists and Nehru and Soper and Attlee and the Liberal Party and the Parliamentary Labour Party. We will not fight or argue or quarrel about who has the honour of being first. But we will contest the claim of Eisenhower, Dulles, Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek, Macmillan, Adenauer, Mollet and Ngo Dinh Diem to purport to speak upon this matter for civilised mankind.

When Nato generals announce that they are planning to use thermonuclear weapons ('as may be necessary') in the 'defence' of Western Europe (how can you defend anything with a weapon you

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admit is certain to cause its destruction?), when Nato statesmen announce that an agreement with the Russians would be an unjustified risk (how can any risk be greater than a method you admit must lead to total annihilation?), or a Tory M.P. declares on the radio that 'we' would rather die than live under Communism (paraphrase: *I* have such little faith in the power of humanity to establish a fitting and moral way of life, if left alive, that rather than risk letting it possibly make what I think is a mistake, I will not only commit suicide but cut the throats of my wife and children and, whether you like it or not, those of your wives and children as well), then we know that not only are these creatures mad, bad and loathsome, but they speak for a tiny minority of mankind.

Why, then tolerate them? Up to now all sorts of reasons have contributed to the length of their tether. World realisation that they are utterly unfitted to be in posts of authority and influence at this crisis of our day is growing, and with it, world condemnation. Yet many who realise, hesitate to condemn and hesitate to break—some out of expectation of economic largesse, some from class solidarity, some simply out of reluctance to face facts still 'hope for the best' or give them 'the benefit of the doubt'. But their refusal to agree to suspend tests is forcing truth to the surface. The lies and evasions are becoming a scandal so open it is impossible to ignore. Thermonuclear Salome has cast aside her seventy-seven excuses and her seven veils. The bare facts are there. These men are ready to contemplate mass destruction; they will brook no limitation on their power to order it, and they are bent on corrupting their own peoples —christian or non-christian—into becoming willing accomplices in the most fiendish acts of wholesale slaughter that warped imaginations have ever been able to devise. To be able to do this, they are content to continue slow poisoning of all the human species, of their own lands as well as others. The fact that the ringleaders in this are British and American is no cause for acquiescence, but for shame, indignation, and leadership in frustrating them. This is the path of true patriotism, of loyalty not only from each to his particular nation but of all to our common species. It is an issue that transcends all other differences, domestic, traditional, political, religious. Fortunately there are signs from all quarters that mankind is beginning to realise it. After all, we are going to prove that we are not rats, but conscious human beings. And in time, before it is too late.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MOURNING VIGIL

'A WOMAN IN BLACK'

THE Mourning Vigil at Parliament of women against the Hydrogen-Bomb Tests is a portent.

They stand there daily in the lobby of the House of Commons, dressed in black, in mourning for the victims of nuclear weapons—past and to come. A mere handful of women, three or four at most, sometimes even a solitary figure in black; yet these nevertheless stand for, and can be seen to stand for, many millions. One woman in black is a mass lobby. It needs only one woman in black to be, as we claim, the conscience of Britain. Black serves the essential purpose of a uniform—to show that all are members of the same group—of the same confession, as the religious people say. Any casual onlooker would think us all one family, as mourners usually are. And so we are, in very truth, the immense family of humanity which is threatened by the H-men's nuclear strategy. We need no banners nor slogans. And we can't be stopped.

It is all very British and traditional, spontaneous and orderly, beautifully inventive and speedy in imitation, highly individual and warmly co-operative. It is, in short, alive. Later much may need organising; but that casual onlooker would find it hard to believe that it is not organised now. It has already a unity of style.

How did it happen, this movement of such a staggering simplicity? Its pre-history is interesting; we learn more of it each day, talking to each other as we wait. The Mourning Vigil exactly expresses the revulsion and loathing which seemed quite suddenly to leap up in Britain this spring amongst women, above all the young married women, at the hideous crime of the H-Bomb strategy and nuclear tactics. It looked as though all the silent despair, fear and shame suddenly boiled up and hardened into anger. ('Just like jam when its jells,' as one put it.)

Perhaps the last straw was provided by the Foreign Secretary's fatuous contribution on radio's Woman's Hour when he blandly announced that only Communists and hysterical fools would make any clamour. But when he was followed by the kept publicists and scientists complaining how grossly exaggerated were the genetic effects and danger to health; that the number of monstrous births to be confidently expected was either much less than stated, or so unpredictable that it was ridiculous to guess a number—the woman in the kitchen went up the wall. Instead of sighing with relief and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

listening humbly to the Men Who Really Know, once she had at last persuaded herself to believe her own ears, she took it lamentably the wrong way. Just how far out of touch with normal human beings can these Top People be?

'Now I realise that they are mad,' said a young married woman to me. 'Do they really think that we are going to watch them juggle with their "Deterrent against the Communist Menace to Civilisation" whilst we watch children die of bone cancer and leukæmia? whilst we submissively bear monsters? They can't be in their right minds. No, they'll have to go'. A mild and gentle middle-aged woman suddenly stamped her foot with rage: 'Immoral, callous, murderous—and mad as well!' These remarks are typical of a significant proportion of women who awoke with a bang and turned almost over night 'Communist and hysterical' if we are to suppose that Mr. Selwyn Lloyd cannot err.

When a significant number of people—say, a few million—feel a deep revulsion all at the same time, something happens.. And someone is found who speaks their mind.

On May 2, a normal Labour Party meeting took place in Watford, Hertfordshire, near London. One of the speakers was Mrs. Renée Short,* a Herts county councillor and prospective Parliamentary candidate for Watford. She spoke with passion on the H-Bomb tests, and found herself demanding that 'the women of the nation become the conscience of the nation'. She found herself saying that if women would support her she would carry on a continuous lobby of Members at the House of Commons until all H-tests were stopped —it would be a Vigil of Mourners. As it happens Mrs. Short is an eloquent speaker: but it was her burning sincerity that brought the women in the audience flocking to her. Three days later the reception given to a contingent of Mourning Women at the local May Day Parade settled it. A short paragraph in a couple of newspapers announced that the Vigil would begin on Wednesday, May 8.

So in less than a week, the first score of women in black arrived to deliver a letter to the Prime Minister at Downing Street before going to lobby—almost all of them for the first time. That the authorities were alarmed was evidenced by the astonishing nervousness of a powerful concentration of police; their parents must have hushed them with stories of the dreaded Suffragettes perhaps? They particularly did not like to see press photographers in action. Perhaps this nonsense could all be got over quickly and these women could be got back to Watford *without fuss?* A tiny cloud in the sky,

*A letter from her appears in Labour Discussion Forum on page 278.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less than the size of a woman's ring finger, should have warned them. Even from the first announcement of the plan, other women in black, not connected with Watford, seemed to be pushing up through the cracks in London's war-battered paving stones. There was even one such stray at Downing Street waiting to meet them. On the next day, although the Watford women were kept away from Parliament because of local elections, four other black-robed women appeared in the House at Question Time. When they had gone, a solitary woman in black appeared independently and was still to be seen when the House rose.

It had begun, this massive movement of women. And it was bound to catch on, however much the instructed newshawks of most mass-circulation newspapers spiked their reporters' stories and threw out scores of photographs from their own camera-men. The two tabloids boasting to be easy on the women's eye, whose search for women's 'human interest' stories has taught them to prefer to penetrate Mrs. Brown's scullery than Lady Muck's bedroom—these became suddenly afflicted with news-blindness, an occupational disease of journalists employed by the Millionaire Press.

And yet, by that first weekend, in the London area at least, the penny did not take long to drop, upon the appearance here and there of a woman in a mourning shawl or black headscarf. And 2,000 women, many in black, or with black bands and scarves, turned out in a torrential downpour to march to Trafalgar Square, when the extremely sober, non-political and largely religious organisation sponsoring it only expected 500. Amongst them, marching *incognito,* undiscovered by press and organisers, were some women prominent in public life, some more than elderly. And, note, they wore black. As we splashed through rivers of rain streaming across Piccadilly one said to me cheerfully: 'I marched, forty-seven years ago, in the funeral procession of Emily Davidson'. To a 'teenager I explained that Emily Davidson was the woman who threw herself under the King's horse in the Derby race. She did that only to help women win the right to vote. What will we do, to keep for women the right to bear normal children?

Mourning is indeed appropriate; we see the point. But where did the idea of black come from. Mrs. Short herself is not quite clear exactly. Certainly the magnificent black-sashed women protesters against racial discrimination in South Africa are not without responsibility. (How fitting that women of Britain should learn from their sisters in Africa's 'Deep South': greetings to you, African Sisters, and our thanks and tributes.) What is the impact of the Mourning

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vigil? These women might be avoided, but it is not possible to ignore them. Watch the Members who try; at the last moment they flinch and drop their eyes.

'You won't be able to keep this up for long, that's one thing', growls an unsympathetic observer. 'Why not?' comes the disconcerting reply. 'In theory, lobbying an average of ten a day (which is more than good going), it would take one of us 63 sitting days to go through the lot—once. And there isn't only one of us, you know. It would be quicker to stop the H-tests now'.

Well, it is a constitutional right, hitherto, to lobby a Member. Perhaps a Question of Privilege might be raised—no woman in black to be allowed within the precincts of the House? Awkward to draft, that. And what could be done when all the women Members begin to wear black? Perhaps these mourners will get tired and at last quietly go *away*? But new ones keep coming; and the old ones will only 'go *away*' back to the constituency, where, deplorably, they have votes and influence. Perhaps those Suffragettes should never have been appeased with the vote. Or means might be found for making these trouble-makers feel discouraged? They are, as a woman reporter notes. 'curiously cheerful'. They are, filled with the happiness of taking action instead of sitting in helpless misery. '*O how comely it is and how reviving*', they feel with Milton.

The House is haunted by a more gigantic Spectre of the Brocken than was ever seen reflected on the mists of the Hartz Mountains. For each woman in black here casts a huge accusing shadow towering over the Palace of Westminster and far beyond. It is a symbolic figure, the life-bearer; she is being forced to be the guardian of humanity itself.

CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS ISSUES, 1957

FEBRUARY: *True Blue Democracy* (R.P.D.); *Racial Discrimination* (Fenner Brockway, M.P.); *Economic Forecast: Set Stormy* (Henry Collins); *China First Seen* (R. Page Arnot); *Marx and the Fenians: Marx Family Letters: Unstable Giants* (Angela Tuckett); *A Bacchanalia of Lies* (V. I. Lenin); *Labour Discussion Forum.* BOOK REVIEWS: *The Changing Germans* (Paula Wiking); *Science and Civilisation in China, Vol. II* (Joseph Needham, F.R.S.); *From Witchcraft to World Health* (S. and V. Leff); reviewed by Gordon Schaffer, Benjamin Farrington, Bruce Cardew.

MARCH: *Arms and the Man* (R.P.D.); *The Clash in Engineering* (T. Graham); *Workers' Councils* (Andrew Rothstein); *New Poems* (Mao Tse-tung); *The New Nihilists* (John Berger); *Marx Family Letters: Dona Torr* (Allen Hutt); *Labour Discussion Forum.* BOOK REVIEWS: *Land of Blue Sky* (Ivor Montagu); *S.S.: Alibi of a Nation* (G. Reitlinger); *Africa South;* reviewed by Andrew Rothstein, Ivor Montagu, D.B.

APRIL: *Into Battle* (R.P.D.); *European Common Market* (Daniel Curwin); *Conference in Ghana* (T. F. McWhinnie); *Factory Committees* (Andrew Rothstein); *China First Seen, II* (R. Page Arnot); *Kunlun* (Mao Tse-tung); *Labour Discussion Forum.* BOOK REVIEWS: *Jim Larkin* (R. M. Fox); *Stories from Chukotka* (Ritkheyu); *The Soviet Union and Socialism* (Andrew Rothstein); *Soviet Turkmenistan* (P. Skosyrev); reviewed by C. Desmond Greaves; Reginald Bridgeman; Clemens Dutt, P.A.

MAY: *Class Strategy* (R. Page Arnot); *Eye-Witness in Kerala* (D. N. Pritt, Q.C.); *The Fight for Disarmament* (Quæstor); *Israel* (S. Mikunis); *Workers' Power: A Postscript* (Andrew Rothstein); *Labour Discussion Forum.* BOOK REVIEWS: *America and the British Left* (H. Pelling); *U.S.S.R. Economy: A Statistical Abstract;* reviewed by H. Collins, P.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE INDIAN REVOLT OF 1857

W. S. ADAMS

[*On the centenary of the 'Indian Mutiny' we print part of a longer study by the late W. S. Adams, which will appear in full in a symposium now under preparation for publication in India later this year.*—ED., L.M.]

THE picture of the Indian revolt of 1857 which has been repeatedly impressed on generations of British school children is of the British people united in horror at the 'atrocities' committed by ignorant and superstitious Indians on British men and women, who were dutifully carrying the burden of Empire in the distant sub-continent. Very little research seems to have been done to determine from contemporary sources the actual reaction of the people of Britain: the omission is itself a fact of some historical significance. But it is becoming clear that the picture of British opinion, hitherto widely accepted, does not correspond with the facts.

The East India Company had few friends left. 'We all know,' wrote Cobden, 'the motive which took the East India Company to Asia—monopoly, not merely towards foreigners, but against the rest of their own countrymen'. He denied that there was any advantage in maintaining the company 'which has shown itself capable of crimes, which would revolt any savage tribe of whom we read in Dr. Livingstone's narrative and which had never seen a Christian or European till he penetrated among them'. The Indian Reform Society, which served as a forum for people of differing views but was mainly the expression of those Manchester manufacturers who wished to build in India an alternative cotton supply to that from the United States, called for a curtailment of the Company's powers, and for reforms both in the treatment of the natives and in their taxation. The *Daily Telegraph* attacked the Company as being the abandonment of Government to 'a single class'; and Lord Palmerston, according to the Greville Diary, showed himself 'very flippant and offhand in his views of Indian affairs and had jumped to the conclusion that the Company must be extinguished'.

As to the reported atrocities committed by the rebels in the revolt, there were varying opinions in the ranks of the bourgeoisie.

Richard Cobden, the Radical, accepted the atrocity stories but wrote to John Bright: 'It is clear that they (the Indians) cannot have been inspired with either love or respect by what they have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seen of the English . . . I find the common epithet applied to our fellow subjects in Hindostan is *nigger*. . . . To read the letters of our officers at the commencement of the outbreak it seemed as if every subaltern had the power to hang or shoot as many natives as he pleased and they spoke of the work of blood with as much levity as if they were hunting wild animals'. Cobden wrote privately: 'The religious people who now tell us that we must hold India to convert it, ought, I think, to be convinced by what has passed that sending redcoats to Christianise a people is not the most likely way to insure the blessing of God on our missionary efforts'.

John Bright, seeking re-election to Parliament at a by-election at Birmingham declared: 'The success of the Indian revolt would lead to anarchy in India and I conceive that it is a mercy to India to suppress it.'

The Christian Socialists passed through a severe personal crisis because of the revolt. Charles Kingsley wrote to F. D. Maurice that his faith had been shaken by the Indian massacres. . . . 'The moral problems they involve make me half-wild. . . . What does it all mean? Christ is King nevertheless.' What troubled Kingsley and Maurice was how God could have allowed his 'Christian' people to be massacred by 'heathens'. In the *Five Sermons* Maurice preached on *The Indian Crisis*, he expressed the view that 'we must struggle to keep that empire' of India. Kingsley recovered from his panic but seems to have remained publicly silent, and J. M. Ludlow, Maurice's friend, was soon writing that 'with a happy and prosperous India . . . with Saxon thews and sinews in the West and faithful Mussulman or Sikh . . . in the East, ready to be flung over the Indian ocean . . . England may safely bid defiance to the world'. Christian socialism was coming to terms with imperialism.

Disraeli suspected (but he kept his suspicions for the private ear of Lady Londonderry) that 'many of the details of the atrocities which have so outraged the sensibility of the country are manufactured'. *The Times* editorially, was among the foremost of those papers which called for 'a terrible example . . . an example which shall be spoken of in the villages of British India for generations to come'. The Radical *Newcastle Chronicle*, now reflecting the growing imperialist fervour of its proprietor, Joseph Cowan, spoke of 'this magnificent dependency of the British Crown' and criticised Canning's 'clemency', saying: 'It is no time for mercy now; our vengeance should be sharp and bloody, and of such a nature as to make our Indian subjects tremble in future at the name of Delhi . . .

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(they should be) exterminated as if they were so many wild beasts'. The *Nonconformist* agreed that 'stern work will have to be done before order is restored and the supremacy of law re-established in India', but salved its conscience by adding: 'But let what *must* be done be done in a Christian spirit and not in the rage of maddened passions'.

There was great relief that the revolt had not coincided with the Crimean War or the operations in Persia, 'If it was to come,' remarked *The Times,* 'this revolt could not have occurred at a better time', and it declared that 'the only question is who shall govern them (the Indians) for they will never be able to govern themselves'. Lord Shaftesbury commented also on 'the favourable time at which the mutiny broke out' and concluded that 'the finger of God has been working. All these things proved that we are yet reserved as a nation to advance the civilisation of those millions of the human race and to be agents in the promulgation of the Gospel of His Blessed Son'.

The *Daily Telegraph* said: 'The suggestions of timidity and of morbid sentimentality never creep into the councils of an empire unless in the period of decay; such a period we affirm has not yet arrived.'

The novelist Thackeray, whose family fortune, lost by him at the gaming tables, had come from India, made the suppression of the revolt a prominent part of his programme as he tried unsuccessfully to persuade the electors of Oxford to return him to Parliament.

It is, therefore, clear that even among the bourgeoisie the reaction took various forms. What of the British working class?

Reynolds Newspaper, representing a non-socialist working-class standpoint, at once expressed sympathy with the rebels. On July 5, 1857, it wrote of 'the commencement of that tremendous retribution which, if there be justice in the world, the gigantic and unparalleled crimes of the British Government and East India Company are certain to evoke. . . .' It declared that 'while deploring the excesses in which the revolted regiments have indulged, our sympathies as they always have been are with the weak against the strong—with the oppressed struggling with their tyrants—with the tortured plundered, enslaved and insulted natives of India, in striving to free themselves of the iron yoke of their cruel, remorseless, rapacious and hypocritical masters. . . . *Our* sympathies are with the insurrectionists, with the mutinous scoundrels whom *The Times* and its colleagues wish to make an example of, by shooting, hanging and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gibboting'. When the 'atrocities' were blazoned abroad, *Reynolds* remarked: 'We at home only hear one side of the question . . . the provocation has been great.' It linked events in India with the extinction of liberty at home.

But three months later, in October, *Reynolds* was beginning to succumb to the infection of imperialism. It was concerned with retaining India by reforming British management. 'India will never be quieted and safe in our hands, unless we alter our policy of rapine, annexation and cruelty—and by letting the natives have a guarantee of mercy and justice in the future, disarm the frenzy of their despair and the resentment of the present. India may be a vast field for British enterprise and trade—if retained by England and the native population—and therefore it behoves the British people to see that no vile mismanagement and aristocratic guilt lose the last opportunity we have of retaining the golden garden of the east.'

Ernest Jones, the Chartist, had long been interested in India. He had written a series of neswpaper articles in 1853, and while in prison in 1851 had composed a long poem *The Revolt of Hindostan* or *The New World,* which was reissued when the Revolt occurred. In its preface Jones makes his celebrated amendment to the Imperial slogan: 'The British Empire on which the sun never sets.' 'On its colonies,' he wrote, 'the sun never sets, but the blood never dries'.

Jones was now almost alone in carrying on the militant tradition of the Chartists. Soon he would himself give up the struggle and make his peace with the bourgeoisie. His last fight—for the people of India—was a magnificent climax to his revolutionary career. On July 4, 1857, Jones opened his campaign. 'A policy of justice and conciliation might have long postponed the final rising of the men of Hindostan,' he declared, and he warned: 'You working men of England will be called on to bleed and pay for the maintenance of one of the most iniquitous usurpations that ever disgraced the annals of humanity. Englishmen! The Hindhus are now fighting for all most sacred to men. The cause of the Poles, the Hungarians, the Italians, the Irish, was not more just and holy . . . you men of England will be called on to spend your blood and treasure in crushing one of the noblest movements the world has ever known. . . . Fellow countrymen! you have something better to do than helping to crush the liberties of others—that is, to struggle for your own.'

On August 1, Jones wrote that 'The revolt turns out to be, as we

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assured our readers from the commencement, not a military mutiny but a national insurrection,' and he wrote hopefully that it appeared to show signs of careful preparation. 'Is this merely "a war with a monarch" such as we have had many of? Far from it, this is a war with people and one embracing greater numbers than any we have ever yet had warlike arbitration with in India.' He covered himself against these sanguine views by warming that 'the insurgents may quarrel among each other; they may display unexpected imbecility of conduct. . . . Of one thing we are certain—that whether this insurrection be suppressed or not, it is the precursor to our loss of India. . . . Our advice is . . . recognise independence of the Indian races. . . . One hundred years (ago) . . . a foreign tribe, the pedlars of the earth, the merchant-robbers of Leadenhall Street stole on a false pretence into the heart of this mighty galaxy of empires and robbed it of its jewel—independence. . . . Within that reign of 100 years a millennium of guilt has been compressed'. He admitted that atrocities might have been committed by the rebels, but emphasised the provocation and recalled British military slaughters during the Peninsular War. 'Did *The Times* inveigh then? No. not with a single word!'

On September 5 *People's Paper* repeated that the Revolt was 'one of the most just. noble and necessary ever attempted in the history of the world. . . . The wonder is, not that one hundred and seventy million of people should now rise in part—the wonder is that they should ever have submitted at all. They would not, had they not been betrayed by their own princes, who sold each other to the alien. . . . Thus Kings, princes and aristocracies have ever proven the enemies and curses of every land that harboured them in every age'. Jones emphasised that the English working people should have 'sympathy . . . for their Hindhu brethren. Their cause is yours—their success indirectly is yours as well'.

On October 19, Jones dealt with the 'atrocities', expressing his belief that they were 'fearfully exaggerated'. But 'even if they were proved . . . they must remember they had heard only one side', and they should recollect the British record in the American War of Independence when we 'employed Indians and paid those Indians a fixed sum for every scalp of man, woman or child they brought into the British camp . . . well knowing by what horrid torture the miserable victims had been put to death. That was not an act of the dark ages but perpetrated even within the memory of living man', and he pointed out that the 'British in India . . . have invented

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a mode of death that humanity shudders at the thought. They, the merciful Christians . . . have hit on the refined expedient of tying living men to the mouths of cannons, and then firing them off, blowing them to atoms, scattering a rain of blood—a shower of quivering fragments of human flesh and intestines on the bystanders. Such an act Nero never surpassed. It is a destruction of the human body which Churchmen tell us is made in the image of the Deity!'

On November 14 he made a fresh 'acknowledgement of the heroic bravery of the Hindhu force'. On November 21 he pointed out that 'Blood breeds blood and cruelty begets cruelty.' On December 5 he tried to persuade his readers that they need not yet despair of the Hindhu cause, but his hopes of a successful blow against British Imperialism were now beginning to fade. His references to the Revolt became less frequent. On April 3, 1858, he wrote of 'the final struggle between Indian Patriotism and British aggression', but his reference on April 10 to his 'hope for the success of our Hindhu brethren' was based on future and not immediate prospects. 'At some now far distant period,' he wrote, 'the development of Indian greatness will be found most consistent with India's freedom from British rule, and its thorough, uncontrolled and unshackled independence'.

Jones not only wrote articles. He addressed meetings. On August 12, 1857, he spoke at 'one of the largest meetings ever held in St. George's Hall, London'. In December, he spoke at the St. Martin's Hall. 'Let it not be supposed for one moment,' he said 'that he sanctioned the mode by which our Indian rule had been acquired, or the conduct by which it had been retained. He considered it from beginning to end one of the blackest crimes in the annals of a civilised country.' In January, 1858, he spoke at a meeting at the London Tavern, at which the old Chartist, John Frost, was refused a hearing when he said that 'if they took the power out of the hands of the East India Company and gave it to the Government they would put it in the hands of much worse men'.

The cause was not lost, only temporarily defeated. The British working class was to pass through a period of collaboration with its masters, picking up the crumbs which fell from their well-laden tables as they exploited half the world: the Indian people were to pass through nearly a century of foreign rule before obtaining independence. It is worth recalling in this centenary year of the Revolt that the voice of the British working class was not silent in the hour of agony and defeat.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR DISCUSSION FORUM

Pride of place this month to the Labour Councillor (and prospective Parliamentary candidate) Mrs. Renée Short of Watford. She explains how the rising revolt of women against H-bomb strategy inspired her to help them to begin the now famous 'Mourning Vigil' at Westminster. Last day for July (short letters, please): Thursday, June 6, to:

THE EDITOR, LABOUR DISCUSSION FORUM,
134, Ballards Lane,
London, N.3.

✶

The Women in Mourning

The world is facing the greatest challenge of all time—the H-bomb. Our survival as a nation, perhaps as a species, depends on nuclear disarmament. Yet the people of this country are being lulled into a spurious sense of security by the statements of glib politicians and the truth is hushed up. Nor do the people themselves know what they can do to avert the impending catastrophe. But we cannot survive unless the public is aroused to a real understanding of the dangers they are facing by the results of the H-bomb tests and unless they understand the impossibility of a defence policy based on nuclear weapons.

Women will be the first to be polluted by the appalling threat of genetic degradation through radioactive poison. None can stand aside on this issue. It is for women, therefore, to join together for all the nation to see to make a stand for the sake of their children and for the sake of generations yet unborn.

The women of Watford have decided to set up a continuous vigil of women dressed in mourning to lobby members of parliament in a great demonstration and protest for reason and sanity against the continuation of these tests. Let those who bear the children of the nation become the conscience of the nation. Our vigil will be continued until our purpose is achieved: suspension of nuclear tests and genuine international negotiations for nuclear disarmament. This issue transcends all party political differences; we ask and implore every woman in Britain to come forward and help.

Lobbying is taking place in the House every day from 2.30 p.m. onwards as long as the House sits. An hour or two in the afternoon or evening from Monday to Friday each week would give time to lobby a Member and to be seen in the central lobby. The psychological impact created by the sight of several women in black with black scarves on their heads in the precincts of the House is quite staggering and will help to create that climate of public opinion which can compel the Government to give a lead to the world. Women might also visit wives of Members in constituencies and ask them to use their influence.

RENÉE SHORT (*County Councillor*).
Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From a Maternity Ward*

I have a baby girl six weeks old, and like millions of mothers throughout the world I want my babe to have a happy and healthy future. As the statesmen of the 'big three' are so intent on the arms race that reason cannot touch them I have not written a mere letter. But I sent to Mr. Macmillan a petition with 34 signatures collected while I was in the maternity home. It remains unanswered. I have just sent a photograph of my babe to the American and Russian Embassies and to Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, saying: 'Please stop atomic tests'. Can I appeal to *all* mothers to do the same so that these men can be forced to see whose lives they endanger?

VAL BANNISTER,
Kent.

★ *To stop nuclear tests depends upon pressure by the peoples on their Governments. The Soviet Union is (at present) the only one of the three 'nuclear' Powers which has called for the cessation of nuclear tests. It remains for the peoples of Britain and the U.S. to induce their Governments to do the same.*

Sanity Begins at Home

Being really fired by the historic Women's March to Trafalgar Square on May 12, I want to ask readers to support the efforts of the organisation responsible for it. This is the National Council for Abolition of Nuclear Weapon Tests; amongst its sponsors are Dr. Donald Soper, E. M. Forster and Bertrand Russell. Formed to give expression to public feeling about nuclear tests, its basic point of view is that Britain should drop out of the world H-bomb race for two reasons. First, because a lead by Britain might save the situation in making it more acceptable to other small nations to refrain from H-bomb development. Secondly, because Britain could then exert moral pressure on America and Russia to stop too. We could lead world opinion to halt the H-bomb race which can only lead to a catastrophic war. Let sanity, in short, begin at home! The Council recommends individual action: that every one should write to M.Ps, and national and local press; take it up in organisations, and organise others to do likewise.

HELEN CLAPSON,
Kent.

A New Big Bang

Having enjoyed their Big Bang, British politicians can now proclaim that scientists here are no less competent than scientists in the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. This proud boast duly rejoiced over, is it not now time to prove that we have a working-class movement second to none, which will sweep the H-bomb maniacs from office, from power and from public life?

MOLLIE HICKS,
Glos.

The H-Test Petition

I am sure many readers will be interested to know of the petition campaign against H-bomb tests recently launched by the British Peace Committee. The terms are simple: its signers declare their 'opposition to the testing of hydrogen and atomic bombs', and 'call for international agreement now to stop all tests of nuclear weapons'. Eight days after it was launched over 20,000 forms (enough for 400,000 signatures) had been issued. This alone is proof of the desire for it.

Are petitions effective? President Eisenhower, before his election, paid tribute to the Stockholm campaign when he explained why atomic weapons were not used in Korea. The other great world-wide petition campaign calling for a meeting of the Great Powers was successful insofar as Four of the Five Great Powers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

met in Geneva in 1955. The present campaign too can succeed. We hope for support from everyone who is concerned for the welfare of Britain and, indeed, for the whole world. *If everyone, every day, does something to help stop the tests, then the Government will be compelled to change its policy.* This would pave the way to agreement on disarmament and a ban on all nuclear weapons.

ROY GORE,
London, E.C.1.

A peaceful, progressive world or no world at all? That is the main question and it now appears to be moving towards some definite decision. Either the powers concerned agree to stop all H-bomb testing or they go on with it and so, ultimately, make the world a place unfit for human life as we have known it. This seems such a final crisis for capitalism that some decision—one way or the other—must be taken; there can be no indefinite postponement. If the wrong decision is made then the human race faces catastrophe. If the right decision is made, it cannot stop there with a mere cessation of testing; it must necessarily lead to further steps all tending towards lessening of international tension and constantly growing hope of a better future for mankind. May the forces of sanity prevail!—*D.H.S., Scotland.*

From Semi-skilled to Labourer

As a semi-skilled engineer with a widowed mother and a young son dependent on me I am thinking of packing it in. I for one cannot wait while Courts of Inquiry investigate everyone's standard of living except the employers', and then wrap the lot up in strings. So I shall apply at the Labour Exchange for a labourer's job. Even an extra £1 would make all the difference; for I am, you see, a *woman* semi-skilled engineer. Now I want your readers' advice. If the employers refuse to give me the male labourer's *rate,* is it ethical for me to demand the male labourer's *job?* There's a case, you know. Take a floor sweeper. That needs re-grading as 'women's work'. For it has certainly been traditionally 'women's work' in the home ever since Rebecca swept up before taking the pitcher to the well and got herself a husband there. (And she probably did three jobs for the rest of her natural, poor soul.) How about it Brothers? What do you advise?

D. SILK,
Birmingham.

The overtime discussion amongst engineering readers was interesting and important, I thought. Now it would be very valuable indeed to have problems amongst miners discussed in the same frank, fundamental and down-to-earth way.—*W.B., Co. Durham.*

Nationalisation ought to come under your microscope. 'Our' nationalised industries neither make model employers nor provide cheap services. The young people say: 'If that's our socialism, you can keep it!' They don't wait to listen when we start explaining that we want the same thing, but different.—*J.E., Wales.*

Wanted: A Spring Tide

The policy of the Tory Government has greatly accentuated the gravity of problems of administering social services in a capitalist society. Housing is one of the most important problems facing progressive councils and councillors. The Tory Government has slashed subsidies and raised interest rates until it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would appear that the only courses seem to be to stop building, to increase rents or to put the burden on the local rates. Refusing to stop building or increase rents certainly mitigates the very harmful effects of the central government policy; but it still leaves progressive councillors with the feeling of 'not having found the answer'.

In this small town of some 14,000 citizens the moneylenders were content in 1937 with the sum of £12,000 as interest and repayment of housing loans; but in 1956 they took £57,000. Incidentally, this is £12,000 more than the council draws in rent for their 1,600 houses. In 1957, the 'economic rent' for a four-apartment house is £120, of which the usurers take £107. Under the new Scottish rating provisions, the tenant now pays the owners' rates as well as his own. The total rate will near enough equal the rent. So the weekly payment expected from a tenant, when there are no subsidies and no help from local rates, will be around £5 per week. This sort of picture can be painted in every centre of population in the country. If we add the tribute levied by the Big Building Trade Combines and Public Works contractors on the long-suffering victims of the way of life in the 'free world', we can see clearly there is no end to the intensification of the 'interest squeeze' on our social services—except we can rise above the usual approach to this problem.

Obviously we need to learn from George Lansbury and Poplar. The big lesson here is, we require some really progressive council to take the lead in refusing to pay these huge interest payments. Just as Lansbury's refusal was timely and led to a change of policy on the part of the central Tory Government, so would such an action as refusing to pay interest be timely and beneficial. It is not really necessary to wait on the Tory Government resigning. Some council could start the tide which would wash them out.

BOB SELKIRK (*Councillor*),
Cowdenbeath.

Now the Leaseholders

'Lucky Jim' rightly emphasises the need for all residents, whatever their status or particular problems, to stand together. Thus they can fight more effectively the onslaught of the insurance companies, property trusts, landlords and bankers described by Councillor Drain as the 'real masters' of the Government. In enumerating categories of victims of property interests, leaseholders (of whom there are about 250,000) should not be omitted. In effect, they are tenants who have been able to purchase so many years' *use* of their homes by putting down or borrowing a lump sum. Their special problem is the reversion of their home to the ground landlord at the end of their lease, with its nightmare of dilapidations to be paid for.

Conscious and active leaseholders are organised in the Leaseholders Association of Great Britain, a democratic fighting organisation which has promoted the Leasehold Enfranchisement Bill to amend the law relating to property held under long leases. This Bill asks for a statutory right for leaseholders to purchase their freeholds at the end of the lease; or, alternatively, for its automatic extension to 999 years. Obviously property interests fiercely resist these reforms. The Association has already taken its policy into the electoral arena in the North Lewisham by-election. Every candidate's meetings were covered by members of the Association: leasehold reform became an election issue. The recent

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Annual General Meeting of the Association carried a resolution to seek affiliation to the National Association of Tenants and Residents. This should develop the kind of unity desired by 'Lucky Jim'. Bringing leaseholders and other residents into close association it should strengthen the efforts of both in defence of the security of their homes. It is a pity that as yet there is no organisation to defend the interests of owner-occupier-mortgagors in similar unity with other classes of residents.

B. F. STERN,
Finsbury Park, London.

They Emigrated to Canada: 1

Forty-seven years ago I sailed down the Mersey in the Allan liner *Tunisian* to make my 'fortune' in the Land of the Maple Leaf. The music hall song of that period was 'For a time I will stay, I'll come back some day, and I may be a millionaire'. I am still here, but not a millionaire—who would want to be one?—but I do possess a million friends, in Canada's working class. As I read your Editor's reference 'They change their sky, not their soul, who run across the sea', I was greatly impressed. Why should humanity be uprooted against its will? Or why change one branch of capitalism for another? In the final analysis they are all branches from the same tree, and no person ever solves a problem by refusing to meet it, or running away from it. They may exchange a 'Nuffield' for 'Wenner-Gren': that is, the Swedish capitalists who have a billion dollar project in British Columbia. As a union leader said: 'I wonder if a fisherman or hunter could go into Wenner-Gren-land, without getting a passport or the blessings of the Swedes.' These prospective immigrants may increase their pay, but the higher cost of living will plough all their supposed gains back into the hands of their capitalist masters. It's a strange paradox, workers of Britain, that the Eldorado of Socialism, viz. Sweden, so loudly trumpeted in past years by all our Social-Democratic friends should be able to send a pair of its citizens with a billion dollars to invest in B.C.'s largest industrial district. It's the first time I have ever learnt of a Socialist country turning off billionaires from its assembly lines.

We in Canada have similar problems to yours and the solution to those problems is the same. The people who stay will be the people who will solve the problem: the future of Britain lies in their hands and our solution lies in our Canadian hands. To rely upon capitalist loans, which always have a string attached, is simply to resign to capitalist overlordship under which no man can have a true personality or be free.

E. H. TUDOR,
Alberta, Canada.

2 *Don't be ill* in Canada is my advice to any would-be immigrant. Here's what my young daughter writes from British Columbia about the health service: 'The so-called Welfare Services are cheese-paring and partial at best. The government passes the hospital bill (our health insurance covers hospital only). They impose a 5 per cent sales tax (*a universal purchase tax.*—ED., L.M.) to cover it. They keep an undue proportion of the tax for working expenses which don't benefit the patient; freeze the wages of us hospital employees; and let the hospitals flounder in debt. Then this 'Social-Credit' government have the nerve to say that they are not interfering with the operation of the (hospitalisation) end of the Act. The Co-operative Commonwealth

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Federation opposition fought for us, and retorted: No! the Government didn't interfere with the money they gave us; they interfered with the money they *didn't* give us! Claims for increases commensurate with the truly dreadful rise in the cost of living drag on for months. In some Provinces there's a bitter battle going on for trade union recognition. Take a case here on the West Coast, where the Hospital Employees' Union narrowly failed to win enough votes for recognition. A 'house' Association suspended four members who worked for the Union after hours; they must not even talk about the Union in their own time! The Association put them 'on trial'; the culprits had to get 60 per cent votes to stay on their jobs, the Association taking on themselves the privilege of firing members. It seems that no satisfactory arrangement was made for nursing staff on shift to vote. So one culprit lost out, by a few votes. If it had not been for the Union threatening nation-wide publicity, she would have had to go. Low wages and high cost of living have another effect; the older people can't save. This comes particularly hard on our older women colleagues. I know one already of retirement age with nothing to retire on. Why have women to wait ten years between retirement and pension, and men only five? Women starve just as quickly.' How we wish she were safe back home!—*C.M.M., Scotland.*

3 *Ties with Britain* are being broken by many means—not least by U.S. journals being let squeeze British papers out of Canada. Yet it did not strike me until recently what a disaster this is, this breaking from the ties of the Old Land. Not until I saw the role that literature plays did I realise its full import, not only as it affected the thinking of readers, but as a weapon to break the ties of Canada with the Old Country, and to shape us into the mould of American thinking. See this local advertisement offering bargain prices for subscriptions to 50 magazines, nearly all American publications; even those purely Canadian journals are closely linked with the U.S.A. through advertising. It is not a secret that the Americans have a strangle-hold on Canadian finance and industry; here we see the same in the field of culture.

British magazines seem in a bad way, many old established journals having to suspend publication, such as the *Strand* and *Wide World* and other publications well known to Old Country people who emigrated to Canada over the past fifty years or so. I was born here, but my parents come from Yorkshire, and for many years read the British papers and magazines, but gradually they become more and more under the influence of the American ones.

With their wealth, U.S. journals have a practical monopoly in gaining readers. They have advantages, too, but by different methods, such as getting top priority in deliveries. Postal workers will tell you that such magazines as *Readers' Digest, Life, Time* and dozens more are sorted first, even being given priority over first-class mail, whereas British magazines are left in abeyance. It is well known that British mail has been left for days and days on the floor of the post office while American mail is pushed through. I believe British publishers should be informed about this.—*W.G., Canada.*

★

(This month's prize of ONE GUINEA *is awarded to Councillor Mrs. Short for her letter entitled:* 'THE WOMEN IN MOURNING'.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A MANCHESTER RADICAL

The Strange Case of Thomas Walker, by Frida Knight. (184 pp. Lawrence & Wishart. *21s.*)

THIS is the story of ten years in the life of Thomas Walker, the prosperous Manchester fustian-manufacturer, who became a militant Radical and emerged triumphant from a trial in 1794, in which he and ten others stood charged with conspiring to overthrow the King, Constitution and Government, and to 'aid and assist the French in case of invasion'. Thomas Walker was a sturdy representative of that considerable body of merchants and manufacturers, thrown up by our Industrial Revolution, who, while zealous for the promotion of their own business ventures, were led by their reading, experience and broad human sympathies to strive for social and political reforms ranging far beyond their immediate class interests. Yet they were rarely paragons of political virtue, and Mrs. Knight is perhaps a little naïve in suggesting that her hero might be expected to be so, when she writes of his opposition to freer trade with Ireland in 1784: 'One would like to think that he had the interests of the unfortunate Irish at heart, as well as those of the Lancashire merchants'. These Radicals had many virtues, but sympathy with Ireland was rarely one of them.

Mrs. Knight tells her story with considerable skill and freshness. Piecing together her evidence from a variety of scattered records, she shows Walker emerging as a successful manufacturer, co-founder of the General Chamber of Manufacturers, Boroughreeve and political reformer. The trouble starts when Walker, though himself Anglican, espouses the cause of the Dissenters, whose attempts in 1789 to have the Test Acts repealed coincided with the outbreak of the French Revolution and led to the first violent brushes with the 'Church and King' party in Manchester, as elsewhere.

Readers may, of course, be familiar with the general effects of the impact of the French Revolution on English political life and on the growth and activities of the Constitutional and Reform societies, and of the 'Church and King' clubs whose object was to destroy them. But Mrs. Knight also tells us what happened in Manchester—of the gradual working up of the outraged feelings of tradespeople and poorer workers by the party of 'law and order', leading inevitably to riots and attacks on the newspapers, properties and persons of the democrats. Walker himself was a victim of the riots and defended his property stoutly with an ancient musket; but his enemies eventually succeeded (in the spring of 1794) in bringing him to trial: among other allegations made was that he had 'cursed the King and wished to guillotine him'. The preparation of the trial has a sinister topical flavour about it: witch-hunting, blackmail, intimidation, bribery, false witnesses were all brought into play. Fortunately, the prosecution's only witness proved a liability: in reply to a question by the judge, he observed: 'I went there when I was intoxicated, the same as I am now'. Though his business was ruined, Walker survived the experience by 23 years. It makes a good story: yet we may regret that a fuller picture was not presented of the social and industrial life of Manchester against which these events took place. It is to be hoped that further studies of this kind, that help to fill in the picture of the Radical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement of the late eighteenth century will soon emerge from Mrs. Knight's, or others', researches.

G. RUDÉ.

PAVLOV

Ivan P. Pavlov, by H. K. Wells. (224 pp., Lawrence & Wishart. *21s.*)

NEUROSIS is the main sickness of modern society. Psychology is an attempt of man to understand himself by investigating his mental activity and personality. It is relatively a young science and in the past twenty years two main approaches have emerged—the objective and the subjective or introspective. Ivan P. Pavlov, the great Russian physiologist, is mainly responsible for the objective, and Sigmund Freud, the famous Viennese physician for the subjective approach. This book is the first of two to appear on Pavlov and Freud, and the present volume is concerned with a review of Pavlov's work and that of his school. It particularly deals with the lesser known aspects of his work on the higher nervous activity of animals and man, the importance of human speech in development of conditioned reflexes in man, and the application of his theory to other sciences, including psychology and psychiatry.

The main basis of Pavlov's work is the recognition of the brain as responsible for establishing and maintaining the dynamic equilibrium between the external and internal environments. In his experiments with dogs he introduced the objective approach of seeing how the dog reacts to the external agents of the world, rather than using the more common one of super-imposing our inner world on the dog. Pavlov was one of the few great pre-revolutionary Russian scientists who lived into the era of socialism, and the State encouraged him in his work on the discovery and the elaboration of conditioned reflexes, which he pursued for over thirty years. He showed how unconditioned reflexes (instincts) constituting the primary adaptive equipment of the organism to the more permanent features of the environment were reinforced by conditioned reflexes for the extremely varied and constantly fluctuating aspects of the environment. He demonstrated how conditioned reflexes help to make a subtle analysis of the environment through synthesis and analysis, and how speech gives man a system of conditioned reflexes far more complex than in animals. By conducting experiments which induced nervous breakdowns in dogs he showed the many factors involved in the character and development of neuroses.

Many sufferers from nervous break-downs have periods of weakness and temporary fatigue due largely to the fact that they are continually excited and active. For treatment Pavlov found that sleep was important as a protective inhibition, giving rest and restoration of the nerve cells of the brain. Hysteria, for example, he suggested was a psychical disorder resulting from exhaustion of the brain. Three general forms of treatment have been adopted—rest and training, medicaments, and sleep. Sleep has been mainly induced by narcotics and hypnotic suggestion to provide, as far as possible, a prolonged natural sleep. Soviet medicine draws a sharp line between ideological, social and political errors and confusions on the one hand and mental illness on the other. Social bodies such as trade unions, sports clubs, political parties, schools, home and rest homes, contribute substantially towards treatment. The book concludes with an analysis of psychology and psychiatry in the United States.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Wells has been very successful in producing in a most readable form a clear and concise analysis of a very difficult subject. Whether one goes all the way with Pavlov or not, at least in this book the reader will be able to make up his mind much more easily than he can do from other works dealing with this subject. There has been far too much prejudice on the work of Pavlov. Many protagonists have been too enthusiastic, while those who have been opposed to his theories have often been prejudiced. It is difficult to remain completely unbiased in the raging controversies that have centred round Pavlov's work, but H. K. Wells, although obviously sympathetic to the work of Pavlov, has given a factual account in a very readable form.

S. LEFF.

THE STALIN ERA

The Stalin Era, by Anna Louise Strong. (128 pp. Mainstream, New York; Central Books, London. *8s. 6d.*)

THIS book is a review of important events in the struggle of the people, the Government and the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. to transform that vast and feudally backward country into a mighty socialist state. The author was arrested in 1947 on a charge of spying, but cleared of this in 1955. Great credit, therefore, is due to her for this objective and constructive contribution to socialist history, and to the discussion following the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

I first met Anna Louise Strong in 1919, as editor of the *Seattle Union Record,* when she interviewed a number of I.W.W. members, newly released from prison. Having known her over the years I am not surprised at her magnanimous attitude. She does not exonerate Stalin. Nor is the blame entirely his. The book, really objective and constructive throughout, is an example to those who have thrown up the sponge.

The chapters on the building of *Socialism in One Country* recall the background of three years of civil war, fomented by invading armies of fourteen foreign countries, followed by two years of famine aggravated by the civil war. Internal conflict arose within the Party about the possibility of building socialism unaided by active support of the workers of the industrially advanced countries, as happened earlier when Lenin introduced his New Economic Policy. Because of capitalist elements—the Kulaks—in the countryside, Lenin warned against a resurgence of capitalism. Hence the terrific struggle to achieve collective farming and industrialisation, and the enormous sacrifices involved. Millions of illiterate peasants had to be mobilised for the erection of steel mills, machine-building factories, railway construction, etc. Stalin's theory that the class struggle continually sharpens as socialist transformation advances may be attributed to the bitter resistance from the Kulaks and saboteurs. Many perished on both sides before resistance was overcome. It was in this situation the police powers grew to be 'A State within a State'. 'Three times in my years in the U.S.S.R.', says the author, 'it was decided to limit the police powers and bring the State Security organs under the law'. This in fact never happened. Plenty of reasons are given for this failure in the chapter entitled 'The Great Madness', such as the criminal assassination of Sergei N. Kirov. Investigation, says the author, will probably reveal 'extensive penetration of the G.P.U. (security organs) by a Nazi fifth column' (page 68).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is a vivid account of the rise of the Soviet Union through the socialist industrialisation in which the young people of the Soviet Union played such a noble part. Witness the spectacular construction of the Turk-Sib railway under the supervision of that dynamic person —Bill Shatov—whom I knew well; and its effect in transforming the barren lands of Asia and in turning nomads into growers of wheat and cotton and manufacturers of silk. The author was present when in 1940 the Baltic States became Soviet Republics and she witnessed the 'take-over' in Lithuania: 'it was all very constitutional and very happy'.

The book, written with feeling and with knowledge, is a most valuable study. With such a background of experience as hers, Anna Louise Strong is in a special position to help towards understanding: and this help she has given.

GEORGE HARDY.

BEST BOOK ON TIBET

Tibet, by Alan Winnington. (236 pp. Lawrence & Wishart. *25s.*)

AFTER a long visit to Tibet in 1955, the author has written a comprehensive account not just of his visit but of Tibet itself. Even the most competent journalist cannot always write a book which is clearly a book, and not just a series of articles; but Mr. Winnington shows here that he can indeed do so. Even when he uses the vivid journalistic technique of 'thumb-nail' interviews with individual citizens the book does not lose its quality but actually gains in vigour; he gets as it were the best of both pens.

The book is far more than a travel book. The reader learns about Tibet, and is made to feel that he really knows it; mystery is dispelled, and understanding takes its place. The practical difficulties of climate and communications, of the shortage of man-power (made worse by the vast numbers who become monks), and the many other singular features of the country and its history, all find their place and explain themselves. Above all, without attempting to give his readers direct political lessons, the writer provides the raw material for the student of Marxism. Why did this country withstand would-be colonists so long and so successfully? Why did the British try so long to penetrate, and why did they fail? How did Tibet react to old China? And how has she reacted to the Chinese People's Republic? All such questions are answered *ambulando;* and in particular we see how the especial qualities of patience, tolerance and understanding, applied by the Chinese Republic with a full Marxist acceptance of the dignity and equality of mankind, are bringing the very old and very singular national minority of Tibet in the Chinese family of nations forward into a new and richer—but still essentially Tibetan—future. (Any faint-hearted Socialists who have been worrying lately can read this book as the champagne of their convalescence!)

The book is well-written, with a strong descriptive power. It is well-printed, too, with fine photographs; but, at the price, it has no right not to have an index.

D. N. PRITT.

RADICAL WEAKNESS

American Radicals: Some Problems and Personalities, edited by Harvey Goldberg. (308 pp. Monthly Review Press, New York. *$5.*)

THE contributions in this collection of essays on fourteen well-known Americans (including Altgold, Brown, Debs, Dreiser, La Follette,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marcantonio and Veblen) vary in their scope and thoroughness. Its basic weakness is the concept that 'American radicalism belongs to a small minority of courageous men and women; that their achievement, while outweighing their numbers, included neither a lasting mass movement nor a profound shift of power'. Most of those dealt with in the book were the product of shifting popular forces and some became a part of the developing peoples' or workers' movement of their era. In most cases they failed to see or have confidence in the historic class role of the workers in the U.S. as the vital force in bringing about a fundamental social change. That is still a major weakness among those in America who think of themselves as present-day radicals. While the editors, Harvey Goldberg and W. A. Williams, are correct 'that American radicalism stands at its last frontier' when they ask the question 'who is to outline, plan and direct America's effort to live at peace with itself and the world?', they are living in a world of unreality when they think of present day radicals to solve the problems. The answer lies with the American workers, in alliance with the Negro people, poor farmers, and other democratic forces. To the extent that Marxist ideas and organisation is extended and strengthened in the U.S. this development will be speeded up and made consistent.

J.W.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

GERMANY IN 1932

The question of Germany is the crux and focussing point, alike for the issue of revolution and counter-revolution in Europe, and for the anti-Soviet offensive. Without the effective participation of Germany, without the crushing down of the German working class, the anti-Soviet offensive cannot count on success. The advance of Fascism in Germany develops parallel with the advance of the anti-Soviet offensive. German Imperialism demands the right to arm on an equality as the price of participation. This issue of arming becomes the central theme of the 'Disarmament' Conference, which has now turned down the final Soviet reduction of armaments proposals and thereby revealed its opposition to any reduction, and its real role in the preparing of war. British Imperialism supports the arming of Germany; it seeks thereby to build the European bloc, that is, the anti-Soviet bloc, under its own hegemony, with Germany an effective counterpoise to France. French Imperialism seeks still to hold Germany under and disarmed, as passive lines of communication between France and its Eastern allies, and to build the anti-Soviet bloc on the Versailles basis. Meanwhile in Germany the ground is prepared. Hindenburg-Brüning on the one side, and Hitler on the other, draws steadily closer in the advance to fascism.

From *A Critical Hour*, by R.P.D.
June, 1932.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; $3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada ($3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page ii of cover)

man that the price of newsprint, up on March 1, has not gone high enough. Note, however, that the Beaverbrook Press has displayed no anxiety about its access to this vital raw material. But although *The Times* was alarmed lest 'the Press Lords . . . make their operations so cut-throat that near-monopoly is reached', it seemed to remain blind to some significant consequences. First, a near-monopoly or close connections with enormously inflated cost of an essential raw material means that the main combines could crush all others at will—which is precisely the trend. Secondly, when the monopoly is with 'a handful of extremely rich men', they have other 'interlocking interests' to protect, and press monopoly gives unique opportunity to control public opinion. Hence the absurdity of *The Times* denouncing any proposal for control to be somehow exercised by Parliament as 'censorship', which 'whether imposed for the lowest purposes or from the highest motives, is a negation of freedom about which there can be no compromise'. But this is looking for the bogey of censorship under the wrong bed. (It reminds me of the young man asked: 'Do you dance?' who replied: 'Just the opposite'.) However, there is one sentiment which *The Times* voices in its leader of May 18 with which we can wholeheartedly agree: 'However temporarily lucrative, printed circuses have no abiding future. There is still, and always will be, a public demand for information which is the bread of public life. The challenge is to devise a twenty-first century way of presenting it, while preserving its true values for this new generation.' That is true. And we feel that L.M. too must more and more devise a twenty-first century way of presenting the daily bread of life—their daily struggle—to people today, especially to the young people. For that Twenty-first Century is theirs and ours, when the voice of the 'extremely rich' monopolists will be heard no more in the land.

Meanwhile, we must struggle to live, as I need hardly underline for readers of the foregoing. For the declining organs of 'popular journalism' it may be a matter of thousands or millions of pounds; for us it can be a matter of shillings and pence—and we don't propose to float a loan on the Stock Exchange. Our collector 'Oliver Twist' asks ruefully after the old, big lists of donations—'the snows of yesterday? presumably melted away in many cases?' At random I turned up June, 1941, collected in May £56 9s. 7d. Amongst those regulars then was 'Anon, Whitchurch'. His (or her) bob a month, in these sixteen years amounts to £6 18s. 0d.—a tidy sum, by any reckoning. Any comments? The May total reached:

£36 17s. 10d.

REGULAR DONATIONS AND RESPONSES TO THE APPEAL include: 'California' in memory of Captain Herman Boetcher, U.S. Army, Spain-Pacific, £1; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s; 'Cambridge Seniors', £3; 'British Columbia', 16s; 'B.C., Canada', 11s 9d; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s; C.T.M., Mill Hill, 7s 6d; 'Old Age Pensioner, Nottingham', 10s; 'Canadian Pensioner', £3 14s 1d; Tam O'Shanter, Grey Mare and Foals (pre-paid); 'Republican', 5s; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 6s; 'Oliver Twist' and Friends, 11s; H.G.B., 3s; S. Morrissy, 10s; D. Rees, 10s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; R. McLeod, 5s; Q. Elliot, 6s; Olivia Greene, £2; Anon II, 6s; M. Philibert, 10s; S. Mill, £1; L. Perkins, 5s; R.F.B., £3; J. A. Smith, 3s; 'L'Humanité', 3s; The Humphreys Family, 4s; W.B.S., 5s; H. Tinkler, 5s; D. Smith, 5s; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: F. H. Bird, 12s; J. H. Wood, 5s; C. D. Say, 2s; R. M. Lang, 12s; K. B. Kay, 12s; R. Boughton, 2s; G. M. Lea, 7s; L. Conley, 6s; M. Paton, 12s; R. Campbell, 4s; T. Hanson, 2s; W. J. Fairman, 1s; N. Hamlin, 2s; N. MacDonald, £1 4s; M. Hill, 2s; L. Bates, 1s 4d; M. Hookham, 2s; A. Opulski, 2s; J. McCabe, 2s; S. Craven, 2s; A. S. Garrido, 7s; J. Smith, 3s; C. A. Moore, 2s; E.W. Barsham, 2s; J. McKinnon, £1 1s; K.B.N. (U.S.A.), £3 7s 8d; I.C. (U.S.A.), 3s 10d; A.S.L. (U.S.A.), £2 6s 2d.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op No. L99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I enclose 18s. (home) $3.00, if first class mail $3.50 (U.S.A. and Canada). 19s. (elsewhere) for year's subscription from the .....issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

LABOUR RESEARCH

June issue includes:
"Employers' Restrictive Practices"
"Pensions Plan"
"Company Finance Changes"
Monthly 9d.; p.a. 10s. 6d.
LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2 Soho Square, London, W.1

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly
Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement
Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE
Annual Subscription 21s.; 6 months 10s. 6d.
ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1

FOR THE MIDGET

Send a Midget Labour Monthly with the 4-months-for-3 trial sub. to:—

Name .....

Address .....

Mention that I could book the order through my usual agent (*delete if inapplicable*)

I enclose 3d. towards cost

Signed.....

Address.....

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy of the.....issue to:—

(1) Name .....

Address .....

(2) Name .....

Address .....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed .....

Address .....

.....

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED